

2002

Relationships Of Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security And Self-Representations To The Adult Relatedness Of College Students

Florence Gussoni-Leone
Seton Hall University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Developmental Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gussoni-Leone, Florence, "Relationships Of Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security And Self-Representations To The Adult Relatedness Of College Students" (2002). *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)*. 1407.
<https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/1407>

RELATIONSHIPS OF OBJECT RELATIONS FUNCTIONING, ATTACHMENT
SECURITY AND SELF-REPRESENTATIONS TO THE ADULT RELATEDNESS OF
COLLEGE STUDENTS

BY

FLORENCE GUSSONI-LEONE

Dissertation Committee

Cheryl Thompson-Sard, Ph.D., Mentor
Pamela F. Foley, Ph.D.
Maribel Garcia-Jones, Psy.D.

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Seton Hall University
2002

© Copyright by Florence Gussoni-Leone, 2002
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

RELATIONSHIPS OF OBJECT RELATIONS FUNCTIONING, ATTACHMENT SECURITY AND SELF REPRESENTATIONS TO THE ADULT RELATEDNESS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

This study examined the relationships of Adult Relatedness variables (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partner's Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity) to Object Relations Functioning (Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence), Attachment security (IPPA Mother, IPPA Father), and Continuity and Integration of Self.

Participants consisted of 340 first and second year male and female undergraduate psychology students from three universities in suburban New Jersey. The Bell Object Relations Inventory (BORI, Bell et al., 1984, 1985, 1986) was employed to measure object relations functioning. The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA, Armsden and Greenberg, 1987) was utilized to measure secure attachment. In this study, secure attachment was measured by the participants' perceived relationship to both their mother and father, not to their peers. The Relationship Experience Scale (RES; Cooke, 1996) was used to measure adult relatedness. The Continuity and Integration of Self (CISS; Wiss, 1991) was used to measure continuity and integration of self.

Stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to analyze the hypotheses. To analyze these hypotheses, 5 separate regression analyses were conducted, one for each component of Adult Relatedness (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partner's Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, and Negativity). In each regression, the Adult Relatedness component was the dependent variable and the Object Relations scales (Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence), Attachment Security scales (IPPA Mother, IPPA Father)

and the Continuity and Integration of Self scale scores were the independent variables. To determine whether or not gender differences exist on the Adult Relatedness, Object Relations, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self variables, a Multivariate Analysis of variance was conducted.

The findings of this present study demonstrated that an individual's way of relating with others, the degree or level of maturity of one's object relations functioning, and level of identity integration (Bell et al., 1987) showed significant zero-order correlations which cross-validated Cooke's (1996) and Wiss' (1991) study but the direction of the relationships were different. These findings were less supported in the multivariate analyses.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply grateful to my dissertation committee. My mentor Dr. Cheryl Thompson-Sard for her support and assistance not only during the dissertation process but ever since I came to Seton Hall. The admiration and respect I have for you have only grown through the years. I consider myself blessed that I have had the opportunity to learn from you. Enthusiasm for teaching is something that comes to mind when I think of Dr. Pamela Foley. You have always been there when I needed advice or direction. Your encouragement has made this *horrific process* much more palatable. Dr. Garcia-Jones, the wisdom and inspiration you provided as a supervisor during my internship were the tools I needed in order to grow both personally and professionally. I especially cherished those gifts as I proceeded along this path. In addition, my sincere thanks to Dr. Pannone, for your guidance, support, and encouragement. I now have a better appreciation for statistics. I wish to thank Dr. Kelber for being my external reader. In particular I would like to thank Lucy Vazquez at Seton Hall for all the years of support and encouragement you gave to me.

I want to thank the students who volunteered their time to participate in my study, without their help my research could not have been accomplished. Special thanks to Dr. Levy for giving permission to contact the teachers in the psychology department to recruit students from their classes. I am also grateful to the teachers for not only allowing me to recruit their students, but for their support.

Last but certainly not least, I want to thank my friends and colleagues at MPC, Nef, Carmine, Maria, Emily, Maxine, Carmine, and Joyce, whose unconditional support got me through this process.

DEDICATION

My children
Jeremy and Susan
who fill my life with joy.
My mother and father
who are always there.
My brother
Albert
who guides me everyday of my life.
My grandmother
Susie
whose dream I am living.
and
to all the patients on the Hispanic Ward at MPC
whose unconditional love, support, and encouragement helped me become the clinician
I am today.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background of Problem.....	2
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Purpose of the Study.....	7
Research Question.....	7
Hypotheses.....	8
Definition of Terms.....	9
Significance of the Study.....	11
Limitations.....	16
II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	18
Object Relations Theory.....	18
Empirical Review of Object Relations and Measures.....	21
Projective Measures.....	24
Objective Measures.....	29
Attachment Theory.....	32
Empirical Review of Attachment Studies and Measures.....	35
Attachment Measures: Late Adolescence.....	43
Self Psychology.....	46
Empirical Review of Self Psychology and Measures.....	48
Measures.....	53
Adult Relatedness.....	56
Empirical review of the Literature and Measures.....	56
Summary.....	58
III METHODOLOGY.....	59
Participants.....	59
Procedure.....	60
Instruments.....	61
Bell Object Relations Inventory (BORI).....	61
Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA).....	64
Relationship Experience Scale (RES).....	68
Continuity and Integration of Self (CISS).....	71
Demographic and Background Information Self-Report.....	73
Design.....	73
Statistical Analysis.....	75

IV	RESULTS.....	78
	Demographic Analyses.....	78
	Relationship of Research Variables.....	89
	Analyses of Hypotheses.....	91
	Hypothesis 1.....	93
	Hypothesis 2.....	94
	Hypothesis 3.....	95
	Hypothesis 4.....	96
	Hypothesis 5.....	97
	Hypothesis 6.....	99
V	DISCUSSION.....	103
	Overall Findings.....	105
	Discussion of Demographics.....	107
	Discussion on Relationship Variables.....	108
	Results of Adult Relatedness Variables with Object Relations, Continuity and Integration of Self, and Attachment Security.....	110
	Results of Object Relations, with Adult Relatedness Variables, Continuity and Integration of Self, and Attachment Security.....	113
	Results of Continuity and Integration of Self, with Adult Relatedness Variables, Object Relations, and Attachment Security.....	114
	Results of Attachment Security Variables, with Adult Relatedness Variables, Object Relations Variables, and Continuity and Integration of Self.....	115
	Overall Discussion of Hypotheses.....	116
	Hypothesis 1.....	118
	Hypothesis 2.....	121
	Hypothesis 3.....	123
	Hypothesis 4.....	125
	Hypothesis 5.....	127
	Findings of Hypotheses 1 to 5.....	128
	Summary of Hypotheses 1 to 5.....	134
	Hypothesis 6.....	136
	Gender Differences.....	136
	Liking/Respect.....	136
	Intimate Disclosure.....	136
	Attachment Security to Father.....	137
	Object Relations Insecure Attachment.....	137
	Object Relations Social Incompetence.....	138
	Summary: Importance of the Study.....	138
	Limitations of the Study.....	139
	Recommendations for Future Research.....	141

References.....	144
Appendix A.....	159
Appendix B.....	161
Appendix C.....	164
Appendix D.....	166
Appendix E.....	168
Appendix F.....	172

LIST OF TABLES

1. Frequency Distribution of Age.....	78
2. Current Year in College.....	79
3. Marital Status.....	79
4. Ethnicity.....	79
5. Religious Background.....	80
6. Parent's Marital Status.....	81
7. By Whom Were You Raised.....	81
8. Parent's Quality of Marriage.....	82
9. How Many Siblings Were You Raised With?.....	82
10. Birth Order.....	83
11. Reside.....	83
12. Family Income.....	83
13. How Many Romantic Relationships Have You Been In?.....	84
14. How Many of Your Past and Current Relationships Have Been Serious?.....	85
15. How Many Partners Have You Been with that Were 3 Months or Longer?.....	85
16. How Long Was the Longest Relationship in Months?.....	86
17. How Long Has or Did Your Most Serious Relationship Last in Months?.....	87
18. Means and Standard Deviates on Demographic and Research Variables.....	88
19. Pearson Correlation Matrix: Relationship of Research Variables.....	89
20. Cronbachs Alpha Reliability Coefficients.....	91
21. Stepwise Multiple Regression: Hypothesis 1.....	93
22. Stepwise Multiple Regression: Hypothesis 2.....	94

23. Stepwise Multiple Regression: Hypothesis 3.....	95
24. Stepwise Multiple Regression: Hypothesis 4.....	97
25. Stepwise Multiple Regression: Hypothesis 5.....	98
26. Univariate Analysis of Variance:Hypothesis 6.....	100
27. Means and Standard Deviations:Hypothesis 6.....	101

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

The character and quality of an individual's interpersonal relationships in adulthood are in a strong way shaped by affective experiences that occurred during childhood, specifically within the child caregiver relationship (Collins & Read, 1990). Within the past 20 years, social psychologists have begun to incorporate work on adult love relationships with theories of development and empirical research on the characteristics and functioning of parent-child relations (Hartup & Rubin, 1986; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Hinde, 1979; Hinde & Stevenson-Hinde, 1986; Weiss, 1986). Of special concern has been the degree to which a child's early attachment experiences with caregivers mold important assumptions about self and social world, which continue to guide relationships in adulthood (Collins and Read, 1990).

The development of human relatedness and its function in the maturation and manifestation of one's personality has been examined by many theorists who have contributed to such noted paradigms as classical psychoanalytic theory, object relations theory, developmental theories of attachment, cognitive and social theories of development, and theories of the shaping of individual identity (Cooke, 1996; Tyson & Tyson, 1990). Assessment measures developed to examine adult behavior and internal mental representations and working models that emphasize human relatedness grow out of two of these theoretical traditions, object relations and developmental theories of

attachment. Both of these paradigms, whose foundations are grounded in classical psychoanalytic theory, emphasize the importance of the primary caregiver's influence during those early interactions as the prototype for subsequent relationship behaviors (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991; Cooke, 1996; Fishler, Sperling, & Carr, 1990; St. Claire, 1996). Hazan and Shaver (1987) suggest not only that early experiences have an impact on adult relatedness, but that *romantic love* itself is a process of becoming emotionally involved that has significant similarities to child-caregiver attachments. Object relations and attachment theories have contributed to our understanding of adult relatedness from separate directions, but as others have suggested (Fishler et al., 1990; Lieberman, 1987; Paterson & Moran, 1988; Richman & Flaherty, 1987; West, Sheldon & Reiffer, 1987), that there is much to be attained by the integration of these two theories in order to better understand adult personality and psychopathology.

Background of the Problem

Only in recent years have object relations and attachment theories started to recognize each other, with emerging attempts to synthesize knowledge of internal representations (e.g., based on early childhood events), information about psychopathology, and non-pathological interpersonal behavior (Cooke, 1996).

Object relations theory explores human relationships, as well as the relevance of self-other relational experiences and capacities for adult relatedness (Bell, Billington, & Becker, 1986). Even though a range of developmental approaches exist, such as those postulated by Klein (1973), Fairbairn (1954a), Kernberg (1976), Kohut (1971, 1977), and others, they all share the same fundamental belief that at the core of personality

development is an inherent need for human relatedness and “approach the maturation of personality by tracing the child’s evolving relationships with others, both behaviorally and through subjective representations of those relationships” (Grey & Davies, 1981, p. 607). From this perspective, the goal of development is understood as the change from a rudimentary differentiation between the self and other, through separation-individuation, to a state of fully differentiated, incorporated, and comparatively objective representations of the self, others, and their possible interactions. Subsequently, this degree of object relatedness establishes psychological health and maturity (Hamilton, 1989; Westen, 1990a, 1991b).

According to Skolnick (1986), the nature of the earliest relationship becomes a framework for later relationships, leading to “expectations and beliefs about oneself and others that influence social competence and well-being throughout life” (p. 183). Hazan, and Shaver (1987) have used attachment theory (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978; Bowlby, 1973, 1980, 1982) as a schema for understanding adult relatedness, and for exploring how adult love relationships are related to early parent-child interactions.

There are considerable similarities between developmental theories of attachment and those of object relations and human relationships, while keeping distinct differentiations between them (Cooke, 1996; Crain, 1992; Fishler et al., 1990). Primarily, attachment theory is interested with the bond that develops between child and primary caregiver and the effect this has for the child’s emerging self-concept and developing view of the social world (Collins and Read, 1990). Similar to object relations, attachment theory developed from Freud’s psychoanalytic theory and shares the premise that the early experiences with a primary caregiver “have a profound impact on the child’s

developing personality, and that the nature and quality of this early relationship is largely determined by the caregiver's emotional availability and responsiveness to the child's needs" (p. 645). According to Bowlby (1973), infants and children form *internal working models* that direct their hopes, cognition, perceptions, and behavior in interpersonal experiences throughout life by means of repeated engagement with a primary caregiver. The internal working model corresponds to the pattern of internal representations in object relations theory that both comprise the individual's impressions and expectations about human relatedness and operate to form their interpretations of encounters and to actuate behaviors (Crain, 1992). A review of the theoretical literature allows researchers to gather significant analogies from the field of object relations to the attachment literature. These are used in developing empirically based predictions about the connection between "level of maturity in object relations, and quality of interpersonal relationships" (Cooke, 1996, p. 15).

The following can be inferred from Mahler's theory concerning the development of separation and individuation (Mahler, Pine, & Bergman, 1975). The maturation of one's personality can also be viewed as a passage from enmeshment and dependency of childhood to the development of a sense of autonomy and independence. Nonetheless, this passage preserves a perception of relatedness to others. Failure to accommodate this procession may lead to apprehension or fear of threatened separations, the poverty of evolution of "a continuing sense of psychological autonomy separate from others . . . [and] inability to differentiate between one's own needs and those of others" (Cohler & Stoot, 1987, p. 177). Kohut (1977) asserted that there are two operations of evolution, one advancing in the avenue of object relatedness and the other toward the enhancement

of self. Although Kohut's self psychology was originally predicated on his work with narcissistic personality disorders (Kramer & Akhtar, 1994), this psychoanalytically based paradigm looked at "individuation, separation, and autonomy as the primary signs of mature development" (Cooke, 1996, p. 15). Kohut (1971, 1977) looked at growth in terms of the self in relationship to self-objects, not as a succession of events. He studied growth in terms of the self developing in a relationship, neither in solitude nor from drives (St. Clair, 1996). "The child's self arises as a result of the relationship; that is, the interplay between the infant's innate potentials and the responsiveness of the adult selves or self-objects" (Kohut & Wolf, 1978, p. 416). Kohut's given concerns are for the shaping of a cohesive self (St. Clair, 1996). It is important to understand all these theorists' views in order for the reader to have an understanding of the background of the problem.

Statement of the Problem

The shaping of human relationships is fundamental to the theories of object relations, and attachment (Fishler et al., 1990) as well as to self-representations (Cooke, 1996, Crain, 1992; Wiss, 1991). These theories were designed to redress the absence of focus on relationship in traditional psychoanalytic theory. A review of the literature in the following chapter supports Cooke's conclusion that while both object relations and attachment theories emphasize the "development of relationships and the understanding of the self-in-relation-to-others" (p. 15). Nonetheless, "they tend to pay much less attention to another important element of internal representations, the development of an autonomous, integrated and positive sense of self" (Cooke, 1996, p. 15). Intimate,

mutual relationships are inferred to be the measure of mature development, while the development of an "autonomous sense of self. . . is viewed not as a goal, but as a necessary by product in the process of development toward increasingly mature relationships" (Blatt & Blass, 1992, p. 404). Both an integrated sense of self and mature interactions with significant others are necessary for healthy personality development (Cooke, 1996; Markus & Wuff, 1987; Roid & Fitts, 1988; Rosenberg, 1979; Wiss, 1991). The interactive nature of personality development is not fully explored by many object relations theorists. Their principal accent is on the individual's perception of and experiences with others rather than on his or her perceptions of self (Blatt and Blass, 1992).

Although the constructs of object relations and attachment theories share much in common, when addressing the issue of object representations and internal working models there is little empirical research to date that directly explores the links between the constructs of object relations, attachment, and adult relatedness (Edwards, 1993). Similarly, self-psychology, which proposes many insights into an individual's personality (St. Clair, 1996), has rarely been examined in relationship to object relations, and adult relatedness (Cooke, 1996). In addition, Cooke (1996) and Wiss (1991) did not explore the element of secure attachment. In this present study the relationship of object relations functioning, attachment security, self-representations, and adult relatedness of college freshmen and sophomores will be assessed. Object relations, attachment, continuity and integration of self and adult relatedness (i.e., relationship experiences) have rarely been assessed collectively. Researchers (Cooke, 1996; Fishler et al., 1990; Wiss, 1991) have suggested directly examining the links between these theories in order to "enrich the

study of the unitary phenomenon of relatedness, which is itself fundamental to understanding adult personality and development” (Fishler et al., 1990, p. 516).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is (a) to examine the link between adult relatedness, object relations functioning, attachment security, and continuity and integration of self; (b) to bring together these areas of research; and (c) to explore the relationships between object relations functioning, attachment security, continuity and integration of self, and adult relatedness of college freshmen and sophomores.

Research Question

This study will attempt to bring together the theories of object relations, attachment, and self psychology and examine the theorized links of these constructs. Consequently, this study will be the first to systematically examine the impact of object relations functioning, attachment security, and continuity and integration of self on a person's relationship history and experiences. There have been other studies which have looked at object relations, attachment, and self before, but their focus was different than that of this study. For example, Silver (1995) examined college adjustment: Relationships to attachment security, separation-individuation, and style of coping. May (1990) assessed attachment security and separation-individuation patterns in a middle adolescent population. In addition, Cooke's (1996) research which gave birth to this present study, examined object relations and self representation: implications for adult relatedness and mental health. This present study will attempt to examine the

relationships between adult relatedness, object relations functioning, attachment security, and continuity and integration of self among college students. Although Cooke's study was similar to the present one, she did not examine attachment security. Therefore, the present study is the first known research of its kind.

Specifically, the questions to be addressed are as follows: (a) Are there significant relationships between object relations functioning, attachment security, continuity and integration of self, and adult relatedness (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partner's Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity) of college freshmen and sophomores? (b) What are the relative contributions of object relations functioning, attachment security, and self-representations to adult relatedness of college freshmen and sophomores? (c) Are there significant gender differences in the relationship between object relations functioning, attachment security, self-representations, and adult relatedness of college freshmen and sophomores?

Hypotheses

1. Participants who report positive levels of Liking and Respect in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self.
2. Participants who report positive levels of Trust in Partners Devotion in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self.

3. Participants who report positive levels of Intimate Disclosure in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self.
4. Participants who report positive levels of Emotional Attachment in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self.
5. Participants who report positive levels of Negativity in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self.
6. There are gender differences on the Adult Relatedness, Object Relations, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self variables.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, key terms were conceptually and operationally defined as follows:

1. Object Relations Functioning: Conceptually, an individual's level of object relations and personality develops from early childhood experiences and relationships that produce internal self-other representations (Bell, Billington, & Becker, 1986). Object relations refers to internal mental representations of self and other (Sandler & Rosenblatt, 1962) in varying experienced and ideal forms, bound together by affects (Kernberg, 1976), memories, and behavioral expectancies, and having a determinate influence upon current functioning (Pine, 1990). In this study object relations functioning is operationally defined as scores on the Bell Object Relations Inventory

(BORI), a 45-item self-report, instrument consisting of true and false questions subsumed within a larger instrument, the Bell Object Relations and Reality Testing Inventory (BORRTI; Bell, 1995; Bell, Billington, & Becker, 1985, 1986). The BORI yields four subscales designed to measure an individual's capacity for interpersonal interaction: (a) Alienation (which refers to inability to achieve trust, closeness, and intimacy in relationships); (b) Insecure Attachment (which refers to anxiety and excessive concern about being rejected in relationships); (c) Egocentricity (which refers to the manipulation of others for one's own ego gratification); and (d) Social Incompetence (which refers to problems of shyness, absence of close relationships, and unsatisfactory sexual adjustment).

2. Attachment Security: According to Bowlby (1973), secure attachment is the held belief of the trustworthiness, availability, and responsiveness of significant others. The result for the securely attached person is a feeling of security; it is a positive, affective experience of relatedness with attachment figures who nurture autonomous functioning, provide a secure base, and afford emotional support and guidance when needed (Bowlby, 1988b). Operationally, attachment security was assessed by the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment-Revised (IPPA; Armsden & Greenberg, 1987). It is a self-report questionnaire which has 25-items in each of the mother, father and peer sections, which yields three attachment scores to assess: degree of mutual trust, quality of communication, and extent of anger and alienation. There is no overall score for mother, father, and peer. In this study, only scores for mother and father will be assessed (see Chapter III, Instrument Section: IPPA). The IPPA was developed to measure "adolescents' perceptions of the positive and negative affective/cognitive dimension of

relationships with their parents and close friends, particularly, how well these figures serve as sources of psychological security” (Armsden and Greenberg, 1987, p. 1).

3. **Continuity and Integration of Self:** Conceptually, it refers to the general understanding of who we are as an individual, and aspects of self-image and self-esteem (Cooke, 1996; Wiss, 1990). Operationally, level of identity integration is measured by the Continuity and Integration of Self Scale (CISS; Wiss, 1991). It is a self-report measure which yields 30 self-statements which addresses sense of internal stability and integration of disparate aspects of identity.

4. **Adult Relatedness:** Conceptually, adult relatedness consists of “people’s experiences and behavioral patterns in romantic relationships” (Cooke, 1996, p. 70). Adult relatedness is operationally defined as scores on the Relationship Experience Scale (RES; Cooke, 1996). It is a 56-item measure originally developed for Cooke’s (1996) investigation between object relations and self-representations, and the relationship to adult relatedness and mental health. At first, items on the RES were derived to correspond to a “set of 12 dimensions thought to tap into the central features of romantic relationships” (Cooke, 1996, p. 23), but the measure was revised to yield scores on five subscales: Liking/Respect, Negativity, Trust in Partner’s Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, and Emotional Attachment. There is no overall measure for this scale.

Significance of the Study

Researchers (Liberman, 1987; Paterson & Moran, 1988; Richman & Flaherty, 1987; West, Sheldon, & Reiffer, 1987) have suggested that object relations and attachment traditions have made steps toward adult relatedness from opposite directions,

but there is much to be benefited in integrating these two theories in order to have a better understanding of adult personality and psychopathology. There is little empirical research to date that explores the integration and relationship of object relations, attachment, and adult relatedness (Fishler et al., 1990). Fishler and colleagues (1990) suggest that more research should be done to integrate these theories to examine human relationships in adults. Cooke (1996) developed the Relationship Experience Scale (RES) to fill in this gap. There is even less empirical research to date that explores the integration of both object relations and self-representations (Cooke, 1996; Wiss, 1991). Although, Cooke explored the theorized link of self-representations, the study did not examine the theories of object relations and attachment separately, but rather collectively. The present study will also not examine the entire theories separately, but certain aspects of each theory will be examined. Separate measures will be utilized to assess the theorized links between these theories, object relations, attachment, and self, as well as adult relatedness.

Object relations theory is one of the primary resources of investigation into interpersonal relationships. Theorists such as Klein (1975a, 1975b), Fairbairn (1954a, 1954b), Jacobson (1964), Winnicott (1965b), Kernberg (1976), and Mahler (1972, 1975) examined the early development and differentiation of psychological structures, internal representations of self-in-relation to object (primary caregiver) and how these structures are externalized in interpersonal relationships. Object relations theory refers to the way in which internal representations of self and others guide an individual's relationship to self and others, and have a determined impact upon present day functioning. However,

the majority of adult research has directed its attention on clinical populations (Cooke, 1996).

“Projective techniques represent the primary form of assessment undertaken to elucidate internal object representations” (Fishler et al., 1990, p. 501). The Rorschach (Kwawer, 1979, 1980, Mayman, 1967, 1977) was the first measure of focus for examining object relations. Other measures were used, such as Concept of the Object Scale (Blatt, Brenneis, Schimek, & Glick, 1976a, 1976b), Mutuality of Autonomy Scale (Urist, 1977), and Rorschach Separation-Individuation Theme Scale (Coonerty, 1986).

Bell and colleagues (1984) developed the Bell Objects Relations and Reality Testing Inventory (BORRTI), a 90-item self-report, true-false instrument intended for use with individuals ages 18 and older. It provides an evaluation of dimensions of object relations and reality testing of ego functioning. The instrument is used in the diagnosis and treatment of various disorders such as borderline, narcissistic and histrionic personality disorders, depression, and schizophrenia. The BORI (Form O) is a shortened version of the BORRTI, which is used to administer the 45-items pertaining to object relations functioning (Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence).

Mainly, research has directed its attention to distinguish people with borderline personality disorder from people with other severe disorders (e.g., depression, schizophrenia) and those without these disorders (Bell, Billington, Cicchetti, & Gibbons, 1988; Ryan & Bell, 1984; Westen, Lohr, Silk, Gold, & Kerber, 1990). This research has focused on discussing differences between those with disturbed object relations and different comparison groups. Yet, the information that is being disseminated from these

research studies has done little to enlighten the public about distinctions in object relations with the normal community (Bell et al., 1987; Cooke, 1996).

Attachment theory is another prominent resource of investigation into interpersonal relationships. Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1980) defines attachment as an enduring emotional bond characterized by a tendency to search for and maintain closeness to a specific person, mainly during stressful events. According to Collins and Read (1990) attachment theory states that:

A child's first relationship is a love relationship that will have a profound long-lasting effect on an individual's subsequent development. Closeness to the attachment figure provides protection and a psychological sense of security. Attachments should lay a good foundation for being able to form other secure relationships, to seek support when needed, and to draw strengths from the support which is given. A caregiver who is reliably available and responsive to a baby's needs forms the basis for secure attachment, for competence in exploring the environment and forming other relationships, and for developing self-esteem. (p. 1).

Empirical literature has been rather silent on the separate influences of mother and father attachment. To date Armsden and Greenberg (1987) provide the one measure, Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment – Revised (IPPA), which separates assessments for the quality of mother and father attachments in adolescences (ages 16 -20). Recent research which used the IPPA, have mainly decided to continue to collapse parental subscales rather than to separate the parental subscale (e.g., Blustein, Walbridge, Friedlander & Palladino, 1991; Bradford & Lyddon, 1993).

The interaction with significant others, usually the parents, directs the shaping of *self-objects*, early internalizations which are perceived as part of the self. Kohut (1977) suggests a psychology of the self in which the self emerges as an outcome of the interplay of the innate nature and interaction with significant others in the beginning years of life (Kohut & Wolf, 1978). Primary caretakers (e.g., parents) who are empathic and attentive offer a sense of security, emotional regulation, and self-esteem (Kohut, 1977). To date, there have been no studies that have examined the relationships between continuity and integration of self and quality of mother and father attachments (attachment security) in college-age adolescences.

This study attempts to present a correlation between the measures used to examine adult relatedness (RES; Liking/Respect, Trust in Partner's Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment), object relations functioning (BORI; Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence, Attachment Security (IPPA Mother, IPPA Father), and continuity and integration of self (CISS) in college students. One of the reasons that college students were selected for this study is because the majority of studies on attachment security have been on college-age adolescents (Anderson & Fleming, 1986; Armsden and Greenberg 1987; Kenny, 1987, 1990; Kenny & Donaldson, 1992; Kroger, 1985; Schiller, 1984). Thus, comparisons can be made with these studies.

Further significance of this study may lie in its response to a proposal by suggesting the importance of integrating the constructs of object relations and attachment (Fishler et al., 1990), as well as self (Cooke, 1996) to examine human relationships in college students. This study may provide insight to help strengthen that bridge through

examining the relationship which object relations functioning, attachment security, and continuity and integration of self have on adult relatedness. Results of this study may provide useful information for college professors and counselors who work with first and second year college students.

This exploratory study is the first of its kind which examines the relationship between these theories: object relations, attachment, and self, to adult relatedness and college students.

Limitations

There has been little research to date that directly assesses the theorized relationships of adult relatedness, object relations functioning, attachment, and self. The present study should be viewed as a preliminary examination of the relationships between adult relatedness, object relations functioning, attachment security, and continuity and integration of self of college freshmen and sophomores.

Although the sample size appeared adequate, one limitation of the study was that it utilized a sample of convenience: male and female psychology students in northern New Jersey universities, who volunteered to participate during their fall semester of their first or second year of college. Therefore, generalizability of these results will be limited to other populations. Secondly, the extent of the validity of one of the instruments (RES) is not yet clearly established as the survey instrument has been used only once before. Thus caution must be taken in the interpretation of these findings. Finally, the study utilized self-report measures, which can be vulnerable to biases (e.g., reliance on an

individual's personal perceptions and willingness to self-disclose). These issues will be discussed further in Chapter V.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review the empirical literature addressing each of the theoretical constructs (object relations, attachment, self), and adult relatedness. Collectively, these theoretical concepts provided the theoretical background for this study. This chapter is divided into four main sections. Each section provides an overview of the theoretical constructs and a review of the empirical literature associated with them. The first section presents object relations theory; the second section deals with attachment theory; the third addresses self psychology which incorporates continuity and integration of self; and the fourth focuses on adult relatedness.

Object Relations Theory

Object relations is a primary means of investigation into interpersonal relationships. The focus of this theory is on the early experiences of the child and caregiver that leave an enduring imprint, that is, a residual fragment within the psyche of the person (St. Clair, 1996).

Object relations mean interpersonal relations. The term *object*, a technical word originally coined by Freud, refers simply to that which will satisfy a need. More broadly, object refers to the significant person or thing that is the

object or target of another's feelings or drives. Freud first used object in the discussions of instinctual drives and in a context of early mother-child relations. In combinations with *relations*, object refers to interpersonal relations and suggests the inner residues of past relationships that shape an individual's current interactions with people (St. Clair, 1996, p. 1).

Initially, object relations was a British evolution of Freudian psychoanalytic process. Instead of viewing an individual as a pattern of biological desires, object relations posits relationships to be at the core of human development (Gomez, 1997). Object relations theorists such as Klein, Fairbairn, Winnicott, Kernberg, and Mahler examined the early development and differentiation of psychological structures, internal representations of self in relation to objects and how these structures are manifested in interpersonal relationships (Cooke, 1996; St. Clair, 1996). Thus, object relations views the individual as a personal realm which takes form and dwells within the context of interpersonal relationship, consisting of internal experiences between different viewpoints of the individual (Gomez, 1997; Greenberg & Mitchell, 1983; St. Clair, 1996).

According to object relations theorists, the core of this theory is that the individual exists in a "dual world of external and internal relationship in which each of these worlds affects the other" (Gomez, 1997, p. 2). Similar to Freudian theory, object relations views existence as an innately varied situation, with anxiety and inner discord being to some extent unavoidable (St. Clair, 1996). However, Freud theorized personality and development in terms of instinctual drives as the fundamental human motivation, with the most critical developmental task being the oedipal crisis. Freudian theorists thus believe

that disturbance or mental illness is mainly due to the structural conflicts between the various areas or structures of one's mind. On the other hand, object relations theory, attachment theory, and self-psychology concentrate on an earlier stage of development, the preoedipal period. These theorists view pathology or psychological illness "in terms of developmental arrest rather than structural conflicts which result in unfinished and unintegrated structures of the personality" (St. Clair, 1996, p. 4).

Object relations theories, rooted in developmental theories, systematically study the developmental process and interpersonal experiences prior to the Freud's oedipal stage. According to St. Clair (1996)

during the early preoedipal and oedipal years, a child's object relations do not seem to be between the id and objects or between the ego and objects but rather between the self (or its mental representation) and objects (or their mental representation with self). (p. 17)

Gomez (1997) and St. Clair (1996) contend that object relations theorists may come from different points of view, but all of them share a common bond about the primacy of interpersonal experiences over inherent instinctual drives. "The need for relationship is primary, and that the self is made up of internal relationships at both conscious and unconscious levels" (Gomez, 1997, p. 2). Object relations theorists see "the crucial developmental issue as being the child's move from the state of fusion and dependence and increased differentiation" (Eagle, 1984, p. 185). It is during this beginning period of fusion and symbiosis that disruptions will cause the infant to feel desiccated and empty (Eagle, 1984). This suggests that a child's interaction with his/her environment and the

measure of that child's relationship with the primary caregiver constitutes the most crucial element of human relationships (Cooke, 1996; Gomez, 1997; St. Clair, 1996).

Theoretical contributions link the emergence of the self with the maturational development of interpersonal relationships. Object relations, while examining the early experiences of the infant and primary caregiver, raise the timing when psychic elements are formed, especially the ego, and the quality of the experiences that the psychic elements have with the object (Gomez, 1997). Jacobson (1996), believed the self is capable of a different quality of relationship at specific stages of development. Meaning that the self, initially fused and undifferentiated from the primary object, grows more independent as it differentiates and experiences itself detached from the primary object (i.e., usually the mother). Mahler (1968) theorizes the infant moving from the primary caregiver through the stages of symbiosis to separation and individuation

Empirical Review of Object Relations Studies and Measures

Empirical literature (e.g. Fairbairn, 1954a, Mahler, 1968; Winnicott, 1965a) suggests that the preoedipal relationship between the child and the primary caregiver forms the child's psychic structure and perception of his/her self-in-relationship-to-others as well as the formation of one's traits and attitudes with regard to other people (Fisher, Sperling, & Carr, 1990; Westen 1991b). According to Fishler and colleagues (1990) and Westen (1991b), these are the core determinants that constitute how an individual experiences relationships with others later on, and the individual's psychological well-being. Blatt & Blass (1992), Ryan & Bell (1984), Westen (1991b), maintain that when the primary caregiver interacts with the infant in a consistent, empathic, and responsive

manner the infant forms mental representations of himself/herself, other individuals, and interpersonal experiences that are qualified by a rich, complex sense of others and an expectation that interpersonal experiences will be shared, empathic and benevolent. Yet, when these internalized representations of the object are disparate, there are deficits in preoedipal relationships that may affect the child's internalized mental representation of himself/herself, others, and future relationships (Gomez, 1997; Karen, 1998).

Mahler (1975) provided a developmental approach to the formation of object relations. She focused on early childhood object relations and made a significant contribution to the understanding of personality development. Mahler outlined the various stages of object relations development starting with normal autism at birth, through separation-individuation at age three (Mahler, Pine, & Bergman, 1975).

Inferring from Mahler's theory following the development of separation and individuation (Mahler, Pine, & Bergman, 1975), the maturation of one's personality can also be viewed as a passage from the enmeshment and dependency of childhood to the development of a sense of autonomy and independence, while reserving a perception of relatedness to others. Failure to accommodate this procession may lead to apprehension or fear of threatened separations, the poverty of evolution of "a continuing sense of psychological autonomy separate from others an inability to differentiate between one's own needs and those of others" (Cohler & Stoot, 1987, p. 177).

Contributions in object relations theory are generally based on clinical observation with patients afflicted with personality disorders such as borderline or narcissistic (Greenberg et al., 1983; Hamilton, 1989; Westen, 1990a). Kernberg (1975, 1984) is widely known for his work with people suffering with borderline personality

disorder. His conceptual framework was greatly influenced by Klein and Jacobson. Kernberg developed his findings largely from his work with clinical patients. He theorized that these suffering disturbed individuals were fixated at an early level of psychic organization. According to Kernberg, severely disturbed individuals (psychotics) are impaired in reality testing and unable to form meaningful relationships.

Empirical studies pertaining to borderline personality disorder, such as those of Otto Kernberg, suggest a fragmented sense of self, difficulty modulating affect, chronic precariousness in human relatedness, egocentric and infantile representations of others (*splitting*), and strong fear of abandonment as the result of early disturbances in object relations (Cooke, 1996; Westen, 1990a; Westen, Lohr, Silk, Gold, & Kerber, 1990; Westen, Ludolph, Silk, Kellam, Gold, & Lohr, 1990).

Fishler and colleagues (1990) report that although "object relations theory concerns itself with the speculations about early development, the empirical literature focuses primarily on adult experiences and only retrospective extension of this to actual childhood experience" (p. 501). The majority of the empirical studies concerned with object relations and adults have concentrated on clinical populations, generally the differentiation among individuals with borderline personality disorders and those with schizophrenia, depression, and normals (Bell, Billington, Cicchetti, & Gibbons, 1988; Cooke, 1996; Ryan & Bell, 1984; Westen, et al., 1990). This method to empirical research has only lately begun to vary, with some researchers starting to study object relations in non-patient populations (Burns & Viglione, 1996; Cooke, 1996; Wiss, 1991).

Projective Measures

Traditionally, projective methods have depicted the primary form of assessment to portray internal object representations. In the literature, there are various techniques suggested for using the actual and implied human interactions explained on projective tests as external reflections of the internal "objects concepts" about which individuals arrange their daily interactions (Fishler et al., 1990). Projective measures are considered to be able to examine the depth and complexity of object relations more than objective techniques. Projective techniques such as Rorschach responses, drawings, dream reports, and the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT; Murrar, 1938) are planned to draw out object representations (Strickler & Healey, 1990). An analysis of the literature suggests that there are various measures designed for employing the "actual and implied human interactions described on projective tests as external reflections of the internal *object concepts* around which people organize their daily relationships" (Fishler et al., 1990, p.502).

The Rorschach was traditionally the first area of focus for examining object interaction. Yet, it was not developed to draw out the sense of interpersonal relationships. The stimulus was intended to draw out the organizing beliefs of personality functioning (Strickler and Healey, 1990).

Mayman (1967, 1977) used the responses from Rorschach measures to depict object relations patterns. His approach is founded on theories of ego psychology associated to Mahler (Mahler, Pine, & Bergman, 1975) and Kernberg (1975). Mayman (1967, 1977) reported a developmental continuum of object relations styles in relation to marked psychosexual themes gained from early memories. He considered that the

content of early memories offers direct insight into one's actual relational world. Mayman identified five definite components of the M: (a) the dynamic feature of the blot that elicits the response, (b) the contribution of fantasy, (c) kinesthesia, (d) object representation, and (e) empathy and identification. The last two components are principally pertinent to the assessment of object relations (Fishler et al., 1990). In a pilot study (Mayman, 1967), raters who were postdoctoral students were able to differentiate very reliably the Rorschach M's of successful from non-successful psychiatric patients. Concentrating only on the qualities of M responses, successful patients tended to see more human figures, describing them with a sense of warmth, openness, and contact, in comparison to the poorer patients, whose figures expressed cynicism, bitterness, fearfulness, or alienation.

At Yale University, Blatt and his research group (Blatt, Brenneis, Schimek, & Glick, 1976a, 1976b) assessed object relations from a developmental/structural view and designed the Concept of the Object Scale. Blatt's approach is based on developmental theory related to Werner's and Piaget's concept of the individual's developmentally increasing ability for articulation, differentiation, and integration of object concepts. The Concept of the Object Scale was designed to rate the cognitive aspects (organization and content) of an individual's inner object relations. Blatt and his colleagues identified a scoring process where human figures on the Rorschach are examined according to the developmental doctrines of:

differentiation (types and quality of human figures perceived), *articulation* (number and types of perceptual and functional features attributed), the degree of integration of the *motivational nature of the action* (reactive, intentional,

unmotivated), the degree of integration of *object and action* (fused, incongruent), the degree of integration of the *content of action* (malevolent vs. benevolent), and the degree of integration of the *nature of the interaction* (active-passive, active-reactive, active-active). (p. 503)

In all six groups, H's are scored along a developmental continuum. The reliability of the scoring appears to be high, with a probable concurrence greater than 90% among the raters (Blatt et al., 1976a).

Blatt, Brenneis, Schimek, and Glick (1976b), Blatt and Lerner (1983), Lerner and St. Peter (1984), Ritzer, Zambianco, Harder, and Kaskey (1980) and others used this scoring process and have been able to produce consistent empirical findings with both normal and disturbed populations. These results support the validity of utilizing this scoring technique for examining developmental characteristics of an individual's representational world.

Blatt and Ritzer (1974), and Urist (1977) stressed the formal facets of object relations through the Rorschach Inkblot Test. Urist approached the Rorschach from a developmental point of view and designed the Urist Rorschach Mutuality of Autonomy Scale (MAS; Urist, 1977; Urist & Schill, 1982). The MAS examines aspects of self-object differentiation and self-mutuality. The measure is theoretically based in object relations, ego psychology, and self psychology. The empirical structure developed out of the works of Blatt and Ritzer (1974), Kohut (1966, 1971) and Kernberg (1976). This measure centers on "the developmental progression toward separation-individuation, with particular emphasis given to the issue of the autonomy of others vis-à-vis the self, and conversely, the autonomy of the self vis-à-vis others" (Urist, 1977, p. 4). The MAS has

shown good potential as a measure of relationship capacities and of overall psychic pathology/health.

In previous work Urist (1977) and Urist and Shill (1982) have shown with the MAS that it can be employed reliably, whether Rorschach responses are scored as piece of intact protocols or as single percepts extracted from complete protocols (Harder, Greenwald, Wechsler, & Ritzer, 1984). Furthermore, these studies have shown initial validation of the scale with 40 adult psychiatric patients and 60 adolescents, who were either inpatient or outpatient (Urist & Shill, 1982). The validity of the scale was demonstrated by "correlating MAS scores with independent ratings of mutuality obtained from autobiographical accounts, from ward staff ratings of observed behavior, and from experienced clinicians' ratings of patient records" (Harder et al., 1984 p. 1078). Overall, the MAS demonstrated that for psychiatric inpatients it should be successful in differentiating levels of pathology, and shows promise as a prognostic measure.

Coonerty (1986) developed the Rorschach Separation-Individuation Theme Scale. Coonerty developed this measure to assess Mahler's theory of separation-individuation in the etiology of borderline personality disorder. The content themes of the scale mirror developmental issues of separation-individuation, which reflects two main themes: pre separation-individuation phase and the separation-individuation phase. The Separation-Individuation Theme Scale demonstrated good internal reliability. It yielded a coefficient alpha.85, and a 96% scoring concurrence was reached between the raters (Coonerty, 1986).

Burke, Summers, Selinger, and Polonus (1986) designed the Comprehensive Object Relations Profile (CORP) as a *semistructured* projective method predicated on

participants' replies to set questions pertaining to interpersonal vignettes. Other than overall object relations capacity, three measurements are assessed: object constancy, object integration, and empathy.

Researchers have recently begun to use the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) to differentiate particular aspects of object relations functioning (Cooke, 1996). Westen, Lohr, Silk, Gold, and Kerber (1990) designed the Object Relations and Social Cognition Scale. It was revised, in 1993, and renamed the Social Cognition and Object Relations Scales (SCORS). Westen (1991a) wanted to examine both developmental levels of object relations and distortions of object relations. Westen (1991b) and his colleagues have concentrated on the "mental representation of the self and others . . . and on the cognitive and affective processes brought to bear on these representations" (p. 429).

SCORS is based in object relations theory and social cognitive psychology. Four measures of object relations functioning and social cognition have been recognized and validated in a comprehensive sequence of research (Westen, 1990b, 1991a, 1991b; Westen, Lifton, Boekamp, Huebner, & Silverman, 1991; Westen, Lohr, Silk, Gold, & Keber, 1990). This measure, SCORS has been applied to the picture arrangement subtest of the WAIS-R (Segal, Westen, Lohr, Silk, & Cohen, 1992), the TAT, and the early memories and interview data (Cooke, 1996). Westen (1991b) reports that three of these four measures, (a) Complexity of Representation of People (tendency to characterize individuals in rich and complex ways); (b) Capacity for Emotional Investment in Relationships and Moral Standards (need-gratifying focus to people versus investment in attitudes and devoted relationships); (c) Understanding of Social Causality (use of precise, multifaceted and psychologically minded attributions of behavior, thoughts, and

feelings) have been found to develop through time in normal children and adolescents. These three measures, along with the fourth measure, Affect-Tone of Relationship Paradigms (malevolent versus benevolent possibility of relationships) are reportedly predictive of social adjustment in both clinical and non-clinical populations. In addition, they have demonstrated to reliably distinguish between borderline personality disorder and comparison groups (Cooke, 1996; Westen, Lifton, Boekamp, Huebner, & Silverman, 1991; Westen, Lohr, Silk, Gold, & Keber, 1990).

These researchers have concentrated on examining the differences between individuals with seriously disturbed object relations functioning and comparison groups. The information from these studies has done little to shed light about distinctions in object relations functioning within a normal sample (Cooke, 1996; Fishler et al., 1990). Empirical research with individuals suffering with borderline personality disorder and other clinical samples permit researchers to make only indirect conclusions about the characteristic patterns of object relations or interpersonal relationships in nonpatients (Cooke, 1996).

Objective Measures

There have been only a small number of efforts to assess object relations functioning from an objective standpoint (Bond, Gardner, Christian, & Sigal, 1983; Fisher et al., 1990; Gerson, 1984; Glesser & Ihilevich, 1969). Bell and colleagues (1985, 1986) made a considerable contribution with the design of the Bell Object Relations and Reality Testing Inventory (BORRTI). One of the contributions deals with the way the BORRTI differs from Westen and colleagues (1991) cognitive-affective measures. Bell

and colleagues (1986) instead of depending on "the projective content of dreams, memories, or apperception . . . [hypothesized] ego functions can be discerned from the way an individual conducts his relationship and the way he experiences himself in relations to others" (p. 734).

Bell and others (1985, 1986) developed the BORRTI, a 90-question self-report instrument to which Participants respond true or false. The BORRTI is based on object relations and reality testing ego functioning. This instrument was developed from the theoretical work of Bellak, Hurvich, and Geldman (1973). The BORRTI "factor-analytically derived dimensions of object relations provide reliable and valid information, from which point theoretical implications can be pursued" (Bell, 1994, p. 48). Miripol (1982) demonstrated the BORRTI to be the most reliable of object relations instruments. Smith (1993) demonstrated that the BORRTI differentiated among diagnostic groups and aids in diagnosis. However, caution is advised regarding its validity as a measure of intrapsychic phenomena.

The Bell Object Relations Inventory (BORI; Bell, Billington, and Becker, 1986) is a 45-item self-report, true-false instrument, subsumed within a larger instrument the BORRTI. The BORI yields four subscales designed to measure an individual's capacity for interpersonal interaction: (a) Alienation (which refers to inability to achieve trust, closeness, and intimacy in relationships); (b) Insecure Attachment (which refers to anxiety and excessive concern about being rejected in relationships); (c) Egocentricity (which refers to the manipulation of others for one's own ego gratification); and (d) Social Incompetence (which refers to problems of shyness, absence of close relationships, and unsatisfactory sexual adjustment (Bell et al., 1986).

The BORRTI and BORI scales have been used to differentiate borderline disorders from comparison groups (Bell et al., 1988). The Bell scales are psychometrically reliable and valid measures in assessing dimensions of object relations of individuals suffering from numerous DSM-IV disorders of clinical and non-clinical populations, and normal (Alpher, 1991; Becker, Bell, Billington 1987; Bell & Billington, 1987; Bell et al., 1986; Bell, Billington, Cerijido, 1990; Civin, 1987; DeSantis & Bell, 1987; Gibbons, 1984; Gibbons & Cicchetti, 1988; Gibbs, 1989; Hare, 1988; Heesacker & Neimeyer, 1990; Humphrey, 1989; Rosen, 1987; Simeone, 1987; Weiner, 1990). Bell and his colleagues (1984) found that individuals suffering from borderline personality traits were characterized by "profound lack of basic trust, intensely painful interpersonal relations, and a tendency toward exploiting others for one's own needs" (p. 739).

Miripol (1982) compared the Bell scale (i.e., the early version of the Bell OR Inventory) and concluded that the "Bell measure was the most reliable and valid . . . and found positive correlations between pathological Bell OR scores and the MMPI Neuroticism and Depression factors, and inverse correlations between Pathological Bell OR scores and MMPI Social Extroversion and Family Attachment factors" (cited in Bell et al., 1986, p. 734).

However, based on the concept that a person's level of object relations could be connected along a developmental continuum (Becker, 1986), the BORI, first attempts to measure empirically, quality of object relations. Second, it tends to highlight general attachment and relatedness items of normal (Bell et al., 1986). In addition, the four subscales Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, and Social Incompetence

(ALN, IA, Egc, SI) together suggest the level at which a person is given to shape fulfilling adult relationships (Buelow, McClain & McIntosh, 1996).

Attachment Theory

Attachment theory "has a profound impact on the child's developing personality, and that the nature and quality of this early relationship is largely determined by the caregiver's emotional availability and responsiveness to the child's needs" (Collins & Read, 1990, p. 645).

Freud (1962), Bowlby (1969), and Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall (1978), theorize that the mother-child experience serves as the precursor for future relationships.

Bowlby's (1977, 1988) theory of attachment is deeply embedded in a general theory of behavior which is the outgrowth of ethology, sociobiology, and psychobiology. Bowlby's work with animals by means of naturalistic observation recognized the need for attachment through primates. In Bowlby's theory of attachment significance is given to the biological function of behavior (Bowlby, 1969, 1973, 1980, 1982). In a paper entitled "The Nature of the Child's Tie to his Mother," Bowlby (1958) theorizes that the infant's bond with his mother is mediated by just such species-characteristic behavior patterns and not by the mother's role in feeding or otherwise satisfying the infant's biological needs.

Bowlby (1969, 1982) studied the attachment of infants to mothers and concluded that early separation of infants from their mothers had severe negative effects on the children's emotional and intellectual development. Bowlby's theory of attachment differs from other theoretical approaches in a number of significant respects. For

example, attachment behavior is seen as belonging to a behavioral system and not in terms of a particular discrete behavior.

The term behavioral system stands for the underlying organizational pattern mediating a variety of observable discrete behaviors. The attachment behavioral system in human infants is mediated by behaviors such as: smiling, crying, following, approaching, clinging, etc. Each and every behavior has the predictable result of increasing proximity with the primary caregiver (Maynard-Smith, 1975). It remains a core assumption of psychoanalytic models and practice that parents respond to their children's behavior and characteristics with expectations based upon past experiences with their own primary care-giving figures (Freud, 1945; Fraiberg, 1969).

According to Bowlby (1969, 1982), a human infant's behavioral system becomes focused on the caregiver to form the basis of attachment. Affectional bonds are formed as a result of interactions with the caregiver. Emotional life is seen as dependent on the formation, maintenance, disruption, or renewal of attachment relationships. Consequently, the psychology and the psychopathology of emotion is deemed to be largely the psychology of affectional bonds.

Psychopathology (Bowlby, 1969, 1973, 1980, 1982) is viewed as a person having suffered or still suffering the effects of disturbed patterns of attachment, leading the person to have followed a deviant pathway of development. Infancy, childhood, and adolescence are seen as sensitive periods during which attachment behavior develops, normally or deviously, according to the experience the individual has with his/her attachment figure. Finally, loss or threat of loss of the attachment figure/primary

caregiver is seen as the principal pathogenic agent in the development of the psychopathology .

Bowlby defines attachment as a continuing emotional bond marked by a disposition to seek and maintain closeness to a distinct figure, especially during times of stress. Thus attachment theory suggests that an infant/child's initial experience is a love relationship that will have significant long-lasting influence on a person's sequential development (Karen, 1998). Closeness to the primary caregiver (i.e., attachment figure) offers protection and a psychological state of security. Theorists (e.g., Ainsworth et al., 1978, Bowlby, 1988) theorize that attachments should provide a good base for being able to shape secure relationships, to look for support when needed, and to obtain strengths from the support which is provided. Accordingly, an attachment figure that is reliably available and responsive to an infant/child's needs develops the foundation for secure attachment, for competence in investigating the environment, developing relationships with others, and for developing self-esteem (Ainsworth et al., 1978).

Bowlby (1973) hypothesized that through the infant/child's repeated interactions with his/her primary caregivers (attachment figures) they form *internal working models* that then direct the child's expectations, images, and behavior in interpersonal interactions throughout life. Within the theory of attachment, *representational models* contribute a significant function. These unconscious edifices are mental representations of the self and others, grounded on early relationships in first interpersonal experiences with the attachment figure. They form the stage for future experiences with new social partners and have long-term consequences for molding personality, organizing behavior,

and forming close relationships (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Main, Kaplan, & Cassidy, 1985; Sperling & Berman, 1994).

The internal working models concept is parallel to the object relations concept of internal representations in that they have as an inherent basis a person's opinions and expectations about interpersonal relatedness and work to systematize their interpretations of experiences and to initiate behaviors. Unlike object relations, attachment style is not fixed in childhood but these elements endure to be modulated throughout one's life by situations in interpersonal relationships (Cooke, 1996). Shaver and Clark (1994) theorize attachment style as:

an increasingly complex and self-maintaining pattern of social interaction and emotion-regulation strategies that emerge in the context of the primary attachment relationship and then become altered and elaborated in many subsequent relationships, always with the possibility of change. (p. 119)

Empirical Review of Attachment Studies and Measures

Historically, attachment behavior has been researched working with infants and young children (Cooke, 1996; Crain, 1992; Edwards, 1993; Fisher et al., 1990; Hazen et al., 1984; Karen, 1998). Mary Ainsworth (1967), one of Bowlby's associates, conducted studies of infants and mothers in their natural setting in Uganda. Ainsworth was determined to continue to research bonding between the infant and his/her mother. In the 1967 study, she observed the child's search for his/her attachment figure (the mother) under situations when the child appeared hurt, hungry, alarmed, and/or separated from his/her mother. Children were separated into three categories: securely attached,

insecurely attached, and nonattached. Ainsworth used this approach to depict three descriptions of attachment grounded on the infant/child's responses subsequent to separation from the mother and then upon being reunited with her. From this study Ainsworth was able to construct measures for rating maternal behavior which significantly differentiated the mothers of securely attached infants from insecurely attached infants (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991).

Ainsworth's (1967) research confirmed Bowlby's view of the primary caregiver's role (usually the mother) in offering security for the infant/child as evident in the cessation of attachment behaviors (e.g., crying, smiling, and vocalization) upon being reunited with the primary caregiver. The capacity of the infant to draw on the mother as a secure base for exploration was one of the most significant criteria for a healthy attachment (Ainsworth & Wittig, 1969).

Ainsworth's returned to the United States where she worked in the clinical psychology department of Johns Hopkins in Baltimore. It was there that Ainsworth began her seminal longitudinal studies of infants and their mothers.

Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall (1978) developed a classification system based on the infant's behavior during the presence and absence of his/her primary caregiver and the infant's ability to draw on the adult as a secure base from which to explore the environment. Three major patterns of attachment styles were identified which characterized the style and degree to which the infant clings to, avoids, and allows comfort by the mother at reunion with her and by the infant's ability to balance exploratory and attachment behavior.

The first pattern of attachment, the securely attached infant, is characterized by having the capability to play comfortably in the attachment figure's view prior to separation episodes. Securely attached infants also separate easily from that person in order to investigate the environment, to seek contact with, and if distressed accept comfort from the attachment figure when reunited, and then return to play. The second pattern, the avoidant infant is covertly anxious about the primary caregiver's (attachment figure) responsiveness and has formed a defensive strategy for managing his/her anxiety. Thus, the avoidant child is detached from the attachment figure (i.e., typically anxious in the mother's presence). For example, the child may fail to greet the mother, ignore her advances, and act as if the attachment figure is of little importance. Thus, the need to maintain proximity hinders the child's ability to re-engage in exploration of his/her environment. The third pattern, the infant with anxious/ambivalent attachment manifests intense distress when he/she separates from the attachment figure and is both clingy and angry (i.e., rejecting) to the mother when reunited. In addition, this child is much less explorative of his/her world and manifests a great deal of anxiety (Ainsworth et al., 1978). Hazan and Shaver (1987) postulate that a child who is securely attached is "healthy, alert, unafraid, and in the presence of its mother, it seems interested in exploring and mastering the environment and in establishing affiliative contact with other family and community members" (p. 512).

Harvey and Byrd (2000) postulate:

A child with a secure pattern of attachment with his or her family will have experienced high levels of support in the past and will continue to expect support in the future. Individuals who have developed avoidant or

anxious/ambivalent patterns of attachment will similarly come to expect a continuation of the same type of familial support (or lack thereof) to which they become accustomed (p. 347).

Ainsworth and her colleagues (1978) have identified the most crucial prerequisites for the development of a smoothly working relationship between the infant/child and its primary attachment figure which is the mother's sensitivity, attentiveness, and warmth when relating with the infant. It is from this experience, that children construct "inner working models of themselves and their major social-interaction partners" (Hazen and Shaver, 1987, p. 512). The resulting expectations integrated in these mental patterns influence the behavior styles demonstrated by Ainsworth and others (1978). It is anticipated that, having a stable family life, there will be continuity in relationship pattern formed on these internal standards of self and social life (Cooke, 1996; Harvey & Byrd, 2000).

Although attachment patterns of children are believed to form by focusing on the attachment figure (Bowlby, 1969), it must be stressed that the pattern is dynamic and rapidly extends to let children become attached to other people (Bretherton, 1985); the secondary attachment figure (usually the father), besides siblings. Marris (1982) reports as this attachment pattern extends to others, its fundamental nature stays constant. Meaning, if the "infant develops a secure attachment with the primary caregiver, then it is likely that secure attachment with others will follow" (Harvey & Byrd, 2000). Accordingly, the interpersonal relationship with the primary attachment figure establishes the type of attachment pattern, and that pattern is dissipated to other members of the family, who are believed to develop the same emotional bonds with the child (Marris,

1982). According to Hazan and colleagues (1994), a person usually extends the style of attachment constituted in early years of childhood (which is stabilized by familial interactions) throughout development to relationships in adolescence and adulthood.

Hazan and Shaver (1987) and Shaver and Clark (1994) have attempted to translate this understanding of early child attachment to adult relationships. Although attachment styles in adulthood differ from early childhood attachment, in that the attachment in adulthood takes place with peers as well as primary caretakers and is frequently focused toward individuals with whom exists a sexual relationship, the fundamental properties endure (Fisher et al., 1990).

Researchers (Hazan and Shaver, 1987; Main, Kaplan, & Cassidy, 1985) have found that when varied patterns of attachment are interpreted to adulthood, styles of attachment in romantic relationships (in certain reports denoted as secure, detached, and enmeshed) can be recognized that are parallel to and present in the same degree as in childhood.

Hazan and Shaver (1987) and Feeney and Noller (1990) examined young adults' romantic beliefs and relationships. These studies using Ainsworth and colleagues (1978) accounts of children were commuted into adult descriptions of the three attachment patterns. They found that attachment patterns of young adults forecast their romantic experiences. The research suggested that young adults who were found to be securely attached described positive images of their family relationship and desired to achieve similar adult relationships. For example, in Hazan and Shaver's (1987) study, the securely attached participants chose the self-description: "I find it relatively easy to get close to others and am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I

don't often worry about being abandoned or about someone getting close to me" (p. 515). Those who were found with avoidant/detached patterns described a feeling of mistrust in their adult relationships. Meaning, that they discovered it hard to get close, depend on, or trust others completely. Young adults with an anxious/ambivalent style reported a wish for deep and secure commitment in their adult relationships and obsessive concerns about losing their partner's love.

In keeping with their self-descriptions, the participants with secure attachment patterns described less trait loneliness, viewed themselves as likeable, and reported their relationships in love as more friendly, happy, and trusting than did the avoidant/detached and anxious/ambivalent participants. The avoidant/detached participants were marked by fear of intimacy, jealousy, and lack of acceptance by the other person in the relationship. The anxious/ambivalent participants reported relationships characterized by jealousy, obsessive preoccupation with the other person, emotional highs and lows, a deep wish for reciprocation. Additionally, they described possessing more self-doubts, believed they were misconstrued and unappreciated, and felt that people were reluctant to pledge themselves to long-lasting relationships. Additionally reported in Shaver and Hazan's (1988) study, the participants with secure attachment styles described relationships that lasted more than twice as long, on an average, as those with avoidant/detached and anxious/ambivalent attachment styles.

Collins and Read (1990) expanded on Hazan and Shaver's (1987) line of research and translated the three attachment patterns into a self-report instrument, which when factor analyzed produced three underlying measures. The first measure consisted of elements regarding the scope to which participants believed that they could trust people

and let themselves depend on others. The second measure consisted of elements pertaining to fears of abandonment and desire for undue closeness. The third measure consisted of elements pertaining to the comfort level the participants were with intimacy and closeness. Although these measures did not conform explicitly to the three attachment patterns, each measure demonstrated unmistakable patterns. Adults with secure attachment styles felt comfortable with closeness, were able to depend and trust, and were not afraid or anxious with respect to being abandoned. However, adults with avoidant attachment styles reported to be uncomfortable with closeness, felt unsure about depending on others, but not very anxious/concerned with respect to being abandoned. Lastly, adults with anxious attachment styles reported being comfortable about closeness, assured that they could depend on others when in need, but very anxious/concerned with respect to being abandoned.

The results of Collins and Read's (1990) study provided significant implications for self-reported interpersonal relationships. Women who exhibited high levels of trust inclined to report more faith in their partner, self-disclosed more frequently, and viewed their partner with qualities of warmth and responsiveness. Women who exhibited higher levels of anxiety and concerns with respect to being abandoned stated less trust in their partners, saw their relationship often negatively, appeared less content with the relationship and not as close to their partner. Women who reportedly felt comfortable with closeness and intimacy described less disharmony in their relationship, saw their partner frequently as being dependable, and they exhibited less feelings of jealousy.

Attachment styles in males exhibited considerably diverse implications with respect to their relationship experiences. Men who exhibited high levels of trust inclined

to report more faith in their partner, viewed their partner as being more predictable, and exhibited less feelings of jealousy. Men who exhibited anxiety and concerns with respect to being abandoned stated less trust in their partners, and viewed their partner as less dependable. Lastly, men who reportedly felt comfortable with closeness and intimacy described a number of positive relationship experiences, saw their relationship in a positive light, were more content with the relationship, fancied their partner more, and were more inclined to marry her. Furthermore, this group described greater trust and faith in their partner, viewed her as being more dependable, believed they were able to communicate better, and involved in more self-disclosure.

Two other studies examining adult attachment found corresponding effects. Bierhoff (1991) found that secure adults have higher degrees of trust with others and a more positive outlook of human nature. In contrast, adults who were avoidant or anxious tend to manifest less trust in others and report a more negative outlook of human nature. Pistole (1989) reported that adults who were secure described greater contentment with their relationship than either avoidantly or anxious/ambivalently attached individuals.

Hindy and Schwartz (1994) found similar results when they researched adolescents' beliefs of their family background. This study concluded that being raised in a family thought of as dysfunctional (i.e., containing dysfunctional attachment styles) forecast adolescents' anxious and obsessive romantic experiences. In addition, Hazan and Shaver's (1987) study indicated that attachment styles in childhood may also forecast relationships with others in one's workplace. Therefore, congruous with Bowlby (1969) and Ainsworth and colleagues (1978) posture, the attachment styles in family systems can be perceived as furnishing a long-lasting blueprint for intimate adult relationships.

Bowlby's theory of attachment (1973) examined the components of trust, communication, and alienation in alliance to the quality of attachment. In addition, he defined secure attachment as the perceived confidence of the trustworthiness and availability of attachment figures.

The majority of empirical studies on adult attachment have examined the association between characteristic styles of attachment behavior and love relationships. Thus, the ensuing facts on attachment patterns and related variance in relationship experiences and beliefs permit us to generate more empirically based predictions, particularly with normal samples, than have been possible in the object relations construct (Cooke, 1996; Fisher et al., 1990).

Results of many longitudinal studies (Block, 1971; Murphy, Silber, Coehlo, & Hamburg, 1963; Offer & Offer, 1975) suggest the significance of close, accepting, and supportive child-parent attachments for positive adjustment, the absence of emotional symptomatology, and social, intellectual functioning in adolescence. Rosenberg (1965) discovered a robust connection between close parent-adolescent relationships and self-esteem. Marcia (1980) found a connection between warm, autonomous bonding to parents and higher states of self-esteem in college students.

Attachment Measures: Late Adolescence

Methodical explorations of Bowlby and Ainsworth's conceptual belief that secure parental bonding furnishes the foundation for later social-emotional adeptness and psychological well-being waited for the design of other reliable measures.

Kenny (1987) tailored Bowlby and Ainsworth's framework for late adolescents in the instrument, Parental Attachment Questionnaire (PAC). Following Ainsworth and Bell's (1974) model that secure attachment fosters social competence, Kenny administered the PAC and examined the relevancy, for late adolescents. The findings suggest that positive parental bonding (positive affect, support for autonomy, and emotional support) was highly linked with indices of social competence (dating competence and assertion) among first year college students. Furthermore, Kenny reported a significant and positive relationship between first year college women's quality of parental attachment and assertion. In another study, Bell, Avery, Jenkins, Feld, and Schoenrock (1985) found a significantly positive correlation between college freshmen students' closeness and social competence.

Kaplan and Main (1985), and Koback and Sceery (1988), using the Adult Attachment Interview, identified three major attachment patterns of first year college students (secure, dismissing, preoccupied) which corresponded to Ainsworth's strange situation classifications of secure, avoidant, and anxious/ambivalent attachment. Kaplan and Main, and Koback and Sceery found that the secure students described limited distress and high levels of social support and were found to be the most ego-resilient, the least anxious, and least hostile. The second category (dismissing) was found to be low on ego-resilience and high on hostility. Lastly, the preoccupied category described high levels of personal distress, high anxiety, were more self-conscious, and preoccupied with relationship matters.

Armsden and Greenberg (1987) developed the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment-Revised (IPPA). The IPPA was designed to measure adolescents'

perceptions of the positive and negative affective/cognitive dimension of relationships with their parents and close friends, particularly, how well these figures serve as sources of psychological security. The IPPA is a self-report, true-false questionnaire which has 25-items in each of the mother, father, and peer sections. The instrument yields three attachment scores to assess degree of mutual trust quality of communication and extent of anger and alienation. The IPPA was developed on two samples ($n = 93$ and $n = 86$) of undergraduate students ranging in age from 16 to 20.

In a separate study to validate the IPPA (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987) conducted research with 86 adolescents ranging in age from 17 to 20. This study patterned a classification scheme (high, medium, low security) which rated college students conferring to the differences in the qualitative nature of their attachment to parents and peers. Students in the first group who were classified as highly securely attached described significantly less symptomatic reaction to stressful situations, greater than average self-esteem and contentment with life, and a greater likelihood of searching for social support from meaningful others when required than those students who were low securely attached. Those students with high security showed lower scores on depression/anxiety, resentment/alienation, irritability/anger, and guilt. Additionally, students' attachment to parents measured for significantly greater variance in self-esteem and contentment with life than attachment to peers.

Bradford and Lyddon (1993) administered the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA; Armsden & Greenberg, 1987) to college students in order to examine the parent attachment factors (trust, communication, and alienation) and their well-being. They reported that among college students these parent attachment factors accounted for

24% of the variance in psychological distress. In another study, Greenberg, Siegel, and Leitch (1983) administered an earlier model of the IPPA, the Inventory of Adolescent Attachments (Greenberg, 1982), and found that higher self-esteem and life satisfaction scores for students in high school were associated to the quality of parental attachment. Furthermore, quality of parental attachment was significantly stronger in predicting psychological well being than attachment to peers. Moreover, the study found that under situations of high life stress, the quality of parental attachment demonstrated a moderating effect on self esteem.

Self Psychology

Self psychology recognizes as the most primary core of human psychology the individual's needs to organize his or her psyche into a cohesive arrangement, the self. The goal is to establish "self-sustaining relationships between this self and its surroundings, relationships that evoke, maintain, and strengthen structural coherence, vigor, and balanced harmony among the constituents of the self" (Moore & Fine, 1990, p. 175).

Object relations and attachment theories emphasize the formation of interpersonal relationships and the awareness of the self-in-relation-to-others. Yet, these theoretical concepts are inclined to pay less attention to another significant class of internal representations, "the development of an autonomous, integrated and positive sense of self" (Cooke, 1996, p. 15). Intimate, mutual interactions are inferred to be the measure of mature development, while the development of an "autonomous sense of self. . . is viewed not as a goal, but as a necessary by product in the process of development toward

increasingly mature relationships (Blat & Blass, 1992, p. 404). Although Kohut's theoretical concept and clinical basis differs from object relations theory, it shares many similarities to the theories of Winnicott, Fairbairn, and Mahler.

Kohut (1977, 1984) is best known for the development of self psychology and his work with narcissistic personality disorders. Kohut (1980b; 1980c) considered that narcissism has its own procedure of growth so that ultimately no one grows independent of self-objects. But instead throughout life the individual needs an environment of empathically responding self-objects in order to function.

According to Kohut (1971), self-objects are those individuals or objects that are "experienced as a part of the self or that are used in the service of the self to provide a function for the self" (p. xiv). In addition, "the child's rudimentary self merges with the self-object, participates in its well-organized experience, and has its needs satisfied by the actions of the self-object" (Kohut, 1977, p. 87). Kohut studied development in terms of "the self in relationship to self-objects, not as a progressive sequence of steps . . . and in terms of the self forming in a relationship, neither in isolation nor from drives" (St. Clair, 1996, p. 156).

Kohut and Wolf (1978) postulated:

An infant is born into a human environment. The child does not yet have a self, but the parents act and respond to the child as if it already had a self. The child's self arises as a result of the relationship; that is, the interplay between the infant's innate potentials and the responsiveness of the adult selves or self-objects. It is not totally unlike the intake of foreign proteins to build your own proteins. A nuclear or core self is formed through the responsiveness of the

self-objects, similar to Winnicott's holding environment and the good-enough mother (p. 146).

Within Kohut's theoretical concept, psychological growth is viewed as progression from a fragmented, egocentric, fantasy-driven sense of self to the evolution of a cohesive, integrated, and positive sense of self. Primary attachment figures who are empathic and receptive provide a sense of security, emotional regulation, and self-esteem (Cooke, 1996; Kramer & Akhtar, 1994).

Kohut (1977) theorized that when these initial self-affirming interactions are not furnished, latent symptoms subsequently in life may comprise a sense of entitlement, low frustration tolerance, an intense desire to be admired or approved of, and a lack of identity integration. Kohut concentrated on the "subjective world of the infant and on how development of the self is hampered when the mother's empathic responsiveness to her child is inadequate or distorted" (Campbell, 1996, p. 489).

Empirical Review of Self Psychology and Measures

Rogers (1951) introduced a theory of self as the result of his clinical experience. Rogers defines the self (also referred to as self-structure or self-concept) as "an organized, fluid, but consistent conceptual pattern of perceptions of characteristics and relationships of the I or the Me together with values attached to these concepts" (p. 498). He theorizes that upholding consistency within the self-structure is of crucial significance. People take on ways of behaving which are consistent with their self-concept.

Epstein's (1973, 1980, 1983) work addresses information-processing functions of the self-concept. Epstein (1973) postulates that self-concept may be more beneficially looked at as a "self-theory." According to Epstein, self-theory is part of a broader "personal theory of reality" that lets the individual conceptualize the nature of the world, the nature of self, and their interaction. An individual's personal theory of reality is made up of "major postulate systems for the nature of the world, for the nature of self, and for their interaction" (p. 407).

Epstein contends that self-theory is created and managed at a preconscious level.

A personal theory of reality is an implicit theory that is developed unwittingly in the course of living, and one cannot be expected to describe their theory of reality if asked to do so. However, personal theories of reality can be inferred from repetitive behavior patterns, from moods and emotions, and possibly from indirect techniques (e.g., projective tests). (1983, p. 220)

The belief that the self-theory is inaccessible to self-report measures marks a significant difference between the thinking of Epstein and Rogers (as well as others who rely on such methods to research self-concept) (Wiss, 1991).

Freud's (1911, 1914, 1923) most important aid to contemporary psychoanalytic knowledge of self-representations appeared in his literature on narcissism (Wiss, 1991). Freud (1914) postulated that all infants initially exist in a state of primary narcissism. In this state, the infant's environment consists only of himself/herself. Libido is aimed inwardly, there is no libidinal cathexis to the object world, nor is there even a consciousness of the existence of an external world.

Freud elaborated on his concepts on narcissism to include the concept of secondary narcissism. This involved the libido being redirected from external objects back toward the ego. Freud's theory of secondary narcissism depicts the self (or self-representation as later clarified by Hartman 1950) as a passive object of the libido. Hartman's expansion and modification of the role of the ego on the whole and the relationship between self and ego in particular have been influential and provides the groundwork for much subsequent psychoanalytic thinking about the self and self-representations.

According to Wiss (1991), the aspect of the self which has received very little empirical focus is continuity of the self. Wiss defined continuity as "the sense that people have that they are the same person from day to day, week to week, year to year. The sense that there is a certain common denominator indicative of sameness over time that is basic and remains constant despite any internal or external changes one might undergo" (p. 28).

A number of researchers (e.g., Allport, 1955; Epstein, 1981; Horney, 1950; Kohut, 1977; Lecky, 1945; Rogers, 1950; Swann, 1987) have stressed the significance of an individual's sense of continuity, unity, or coherence. Allport, Horney, and Rogers believed this to be a crucial aspect of one's mental well-being. Two of the researchers, Lecky (1945) and Epstein (1981), hypothesized that attempting to preserve congruity and coherence of the self is a paramount motivational force. Fast (1985), James (1890), and Jourard (1971) have emphasized the significance of unifying the multiple self-representations of the person. As noted by clinical psychologists, a lack of integration of

self-representations is a rudiment trait of people suffering with borderline personality disorder (Kernberg, 1975; Westen, 1991b; Westen & Cohen, 1991; Wiss, 1988).

The most significant work pertinent to this concept (continuity and integration of self) has been completed by Marcia (1966, 1976, 1980), and Waterman and Goldman (1976) formulated their concepts on Erikson's (1959/1963, 1980, 1988) comprehensive theory of development (i.e., psychosocial stages) which illustrates a method that stressed maturation of individual identity as a required prototype to evolution of mature relationships. According to Wiss (1991), "identity as described by Erikson and operationalized by Marcia, which primarily involves commitment to and stability of roles, occupation, and ideology, is certainly important (but not sufficient) to maintaining a sense of continuity" (p. 29).

Erikson (1959/1963, 1980, 1988) theorized that the resolution of each developmental conflict fastens on the interaction of one's traits and the support furnished by the social environment. Thus, relationships with others are seen as an outgrowth of identity maturation, "it is only after a reasonable sense of identity has been established that real *intimacy* with the other sex (or, for that matter, with any other person or even oneself) is possible" (Erikson, 1980, p. 101). The element of identity inside this framework is often more formalized than the much inclusive "sense of self" previously reported (Cooke, 1996; Wiss, 1991).

A sense of self applies to one's typical grasp of who one is as an individual, and may contain facets of self-images as well as self-esteem. But, according to Marcia (1994, p. 64) "ego identity refers more specifically to a personality structure consisting of an individual's organization of drives (needs, wishes) and abilities (skills, competencies) in

the context to his or her particular culture's demands (requirements) and rewards (gratifications)." Marcia further illustrates:

Identity formation . . . requires a solid sense of self, a structure whose initial formation precedes identity by more than a decade. To even be aware of who one has been, let alone decide how to integrate oneself into one's societal milieu, requires some inner solidity. . . [individual's with immature or pathological personality organizations] cannot commit themselves to coherent directions in the world because there is no stable self to commit. Hence, one may say that a secure, stable, integrated self, developed in early childhood, is necessary, but not sufficient, condition for an identity. (pp. 93-94)

It may be beneficial to review her work on ego identity (see Marcia, 1994, 1996, for overview) in expanding the psychological and interpersonal implications of fragmentation, disorganization and lack of continuity of self.

Marcia's (1996) study examined university student's levels of commitment to an occupation or ideology. The results of the study recognized four types of identity status: identity achieved identity diffusion, identity moratorium, and identity foreclosure. An identity achieved, characteristic of those who formed commitments ensuing an exploratory phase, has generally been described to have strong self-esteem, well-organized thinking even when experiencing stress, and shown to have successful, mature, and intimate interpersonal relations (Cooke, 1996; Kroger, 1993; Marcia, 1967; Orlofsky Marcia, & Lesser, 1973; Wiss, 1991). Those characterized with identity diffusion (lack strong commitments), have been associated with low degrees of cognitive complexity, immature ego formation, disorganized thought processes, particularly when stressed, low

self-certainty, and superficial and unstable intimate relationships (Berzonsky & Neimeyer, 1988; Cooke, 1996; Fitch & Adams, 1983; Kroger, 1992a, 1992b; Marcia, 1994; Orlofsky et al., 1973; Slugoski, Marcia, & Koopman, 1984; Wiss, 1991). These four categories appear to ensure the method in which young adults reconcile their sense of identity and continue to undertake life selections such as vocation, politics, religion, ethnicity, sexual beliefs, to name a few (Marcia, 1994; Orlofsky et al., 1973).

Measures

The Selves Questionnaire is an instrument developed by Higgins, Klein, and Strauman (1985) to assess discrepancies between various domains of self (actual, ideal, and ought) and standpoints of the self (own, mother, father). The participant was asked to list up to ten attributes describing a specific domain of himself/herself from a particular point of view. For example, "Please list the attributes of the type of person you believe you actually are now," or "Please list the attributes of the type of person your father would ideally like you to be." Participants are also asked to rate the extent or extremity of each attribute on a scale of one to four. Scoring for magnitude of discrepancy followed the method illustrated by Strauman and Higgins (1988). The Selves Questionnaires was scored by the primary examiner and a trained undergraduate. The interrater correlation was .84. Convergent and discriminant validity of the instrument has been cross-validated by other studies. In addition, a test-retest correlation was found at an interval of two months (Strauman & Higgins, 1981).

Linville (1985) developed the Linville Self-Complexity Measure. This instrument is intended to assess self-complexity. Linville defines self-complexity in terms of the

number and distinctiveness of self-aspects an individual uses to describe himself/herself. Participants (college students) were given a packet of thirty-three index cards. Each index card contained the name of one trait. Participants were asked to sort the cards into groups of traits, where each group described an aspect of themselves.

Roid and Fitts (1988) developed the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS). This instrument consists of 100 self-descriptive statements. Each statement is rated on a Likert scale from one to five. A total of twenty-nine scores can be obtained from this measure. The scores are indicative of the participant's pattern of responding, description of his/her identity, self-satisfaction, behavior, moral-ethical self, physical self, social self, and family self. In addition, the scores reflect overall level of self-esteem, level of adjustment, and general maladjustment. Internal consistency coefficients ranged from .70 to .87. Fitts (1965) reported for the twenty-nine scores, test-retest reliability coefficients ranged from .60 to .92. According to Roid and Fitts (1988) correlations between the TSCS total score (overall self-esteem) and other related measures, the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory and Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale, ranged from .51 to .80.

Wiss (1991) developed the Continuity and Integration of Self Scale (CISS). The CISS is a self-report, true-false, measure is comprised of 30 self-statements. These statements address sense of internal stability and integration of different aspects of identity. The CISS is designed to assess a person's continuity and integration of self. Wiss defined continuity as: "the sense that people have that they are the same person day to day, week to week, year to year; the sense that there is a certain common denominator

indicative of sameness over time that is basic and remains constant despite any internal or external changes one might undergo" (p. 28)

Wiss (1991) believed that besides an individual's stability of ideals there are four inter-connected traits:

First is continuity of self-representations. For example, if one day I perceive myself to be thin and moderately handsome, and the next day as overweight and ugly; or one day as shy and the next as gregarious, this can obviously lead to a sense of discontinuity. Second, the ability to integrate self-representations is essential in maintaining a sense of continuity. If I see myself as only shy one day and only gregarious the next there will be discontinuity, but if I see myself as shy around strangers and gregarious among friends this integration provides a sense of continuity. Third, stability of self-esteem seems inextricably bound with continuity of self. In theory, I believe this factor can be separated out, but in reality one's evaluations of oneself to shape and color one's conceptions of oneself, that wide vacillations in esteem will invariably be accompanied by vacillations in the nature of those conceptions or representations that are being evaluated. Such vacillations can be modulated by the ability to integrate representations. Finally, continuity of the self as subjective agent (the Jamesian "I") must exist for there to be an experience of continuity. (p. 30)

Wiss (1991) postulates that one's sense of self forms through relationships with others, and once developed, play a prominent role in the nature of an individual's object relations and mental well-being.

The literature cited in the previous section considers carefully that both a unified sense of self and mature relationships with individuals of significance are required for healthy formation of one's personality, even though various procedures do lean toward one element of development more than the other. "Positive, mature working models of relationships and self have been shown to have reliable implications for intimate relationships and for indicators of psychological stability and mental health" (Cooke, 1996, p. 18).

Adult Relatedness

Fishler and colleagues (1990) defined relationships as the:

"broadest descriptor for an interpersonal interaction that has some actual or intended continuity over time with some degree of emotional investment . . . attachment has a more specific meaning. Attachment is generally understood as having three properties: (a) there is comfort provided by the presence of the attachment figure, (b) there are attempts to remain in proximity of the attachment figure, and (c) there is distress in the face of a threat to accessibility of the attachment figure. In this sense, object relationships are the most global category of interaction encompassing virtually all relationships, whereas attachment bonds are present in some, but not all, relationships. (p. 501)

Empirical Review of the Literature and Measures

The research of adult relationships has grown within the past decade across a variety of disciplines (Berscheid & Snyder, 1989; Fisher et al., 1990). For example,

social psychologists have increased efforts to examine the processes involved in close human relationships (Holmes & Boon, 1990). Yet, empirical literature has been, relatively silent to provide information about one's reported quality of relationship experiences (Cooke, 1996).

Hazen and Shaver (1987) developed the Attachment Style Measure. This measure was designed to measure dimensions underlying adult attachment styles. Attachment Style Measure is based on several factors: First, Ainsworth and colleague's (1978) study of infant attachment styles (secure, avoidant anxious/ambivalent), and Second, on Bowlby's postulation about mental models of self that may in part be decided by childhood relationships with parents. Hazan and Shaver (1987) converted the language from Ainsworth and other's (1978) study in order to make it more suitable for adult relationships. Participants were asked to select the description that best characterized them as: secure, avoidant, or anxious. In regards to questions of validity, the Attachment Style Measure found that adults with different styles varied as expected in the way they experienced love. In addition, adult attachment was correlated to reports of early parent-child relationships.

Relationship Closeness Inventory (RCI) developed by Berscheid, Snyder, and Omoto (1989) was designed to assess relationship closeness (closest relationship). Berscheid and colleagues were influenced by Kelly and others (1983) theoretical conceptualization of closeness, as heuristic, that is "conceptualization is itself only one way to view the important properties of relationship closeness" (Berscheid et al., 1989, p. 805). College students participated in the development of this measure. The sample consisted of 241 students ranging in age from 18 to 49. With regard to the validity, the

RCI was found to predict certain relationship phenomena that a closeness measure should be expected to predict if current theories about closeness are accurate.

Cooke (1996) developed the Relationship Experience Scale (RES), as an adult relatedness instrument. Cooke's approach is based on attachment literature. The RES is designed to assess one's quality of relationship experiences. In addition, the RES is as an indirect measure of actual relationship behavior within the confines of a specific type and instance of adult relatedness. The instrument was found to have excellent internal consistency and split-half reliability. The RES subscales (Liking/Respect, Negativity, Trust in Partner's Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment) also demonstrated adequate reliability and convergent validity with measures of object relations. The RES presents as a valid and reliable criterion measure of relationship experiences.

Summary

This chapter has reviewed empirical literature and research on the nature and the importance of object relations and attachment theories on early childhood experiences. Primarily, focus was on the relational interactions between the child and primary caregiver and aspects of the self. The current study was designed to make a contribution to the existing research by examining the relationship between object relations functioning, attachment security, continuity and integration of self, and adult relatedness of college students. Yet, studies on human relationships and social support have been hindered by an increase of criterion and inadequate integration of theories (Sperling & Berلمان, 1994).

Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methodology utilized, participant selection, procedures followed, instruments administered and the method of data analysis.

Participants

Participants in this study were 304 first and second year undergraduate psychology students from three universities in suburban New Jersey. There were 192 women and 148 men. Initial identification of participants was based on the 16 to 20 year age requirement stipulated by the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA) (Armsden and Greenberg, 1987). Participants, all of whom volunteered for the study, were college freshmen (51.8%, $n = 176$) or sophomores (48.2%, $n = 164$). The age ranged from 17 to 20, and most participants were either 18 (43.8%, $n = 149$) or 19 (33.5% $n = 114$). The mean age was 18.65 years old. The majority of the participants were raised by both parents (78.5%). The majority of the participants were White/Caucasian (63.5%, $n = 216$). The participants also included African-American (13.8%, $n = 47$), Hispanics (12.4%, $n = 42$), Asians (6.2%, $n = 21$), and other ethnicities not specifically identified (4.1%, $n = 14$).

Procedure

Participation in the study took place on campus. Depending upon the student's schedule, they were tested either in their classroom or at pre-arranged scheduled times. Testing was completed in one session. Informed consent forms (see Appendix A) were distributed at the time of the study. Participation was strictly voluntary. The voluntary nature of participation was explained, as well the choice to terminate the testing at any time of the administration. Participants consisted of college freshmen (51.8%, $n = 176$) and sophomores (48.2%, $n = 164$). All participants were given an envelope which included; consent form (see Appendix A), instructions for completing the self-report measures (see Appendix B), request form for summary of results of the study (see Appendix C), the Demographical and Background Information Self-Report (see Appendix D), the Bell Object Relations Inventory (BORI; Bell, Billington, & Becker, 1984, 1985, 1986), the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA; Armsden and Greenberg, 1987), the Relationship Experience Scale (RES; Cooke, 1996), and the Continuity and Integration of Self Scale (CISS; Wiss, 1991). Once each participant completed the survey, he or she placed the questionnaires into an envelope. An assurance of complete anonymity and confidentiality was assured by assigning each participant with an identification code number in lieu of other identifying information. For example, each envelope had been previously coded with an ID number (e.g., AA1, AA2). The completed envelope was returned to the faculty member in the classroom, at which time each participant received a written description of the purpose of the study (see Appendix F). In addition, the participants were notified that the examiner would be on campus available to answer questions during the data collection period. Times and locations were

included in the purpose of this study (Appendix F). Those participants who completed the study at home and returned the envelope to the examiner were able to contact the examiner via e-mail or phone to answer questions.

Instruments

Scales from the following four research measures were used to explore the three independent variables: (a) object relations functioning; (b) attachment security; (c) continuity and integration of self, and (d) the dependent variable: adult relatedness. In addition a demographic/background questionnaire was included to obtain basic information.

Bell Object Relations Inventory (BORI)

The Bell Object Relations Inventory (BORI; Bell et al., 1984, 1985, 1986) measures an individual's capacity for human relatedness, and is viewed as a multidimensional construct (Urist, 1980). The BORI is rooted within a larger questionnaire, the Bell Object Relation Reality Testing Inventory (BORRTI; Bell, 1985) that provides an assessment of dimensions of object relations and reality testing ego functioning. According to Bell (1986), the BORI can be applied to clinical or research designs independently from the BORRTI. The BORI items are obtained from section O, of the BORRTI. Initially, Bell et al. (1986) developed the BORI scale from a structured clinical interview measuring relationship experiences and characteristic models of relating that was created by Bellak, Hurvich, and Gediman (1973).

The BORI is a 45-item true-false questionnaire pertaining to object relations. It measures four dimensions: Alienation; Insecure Attachment; Egocentricity; and Social Incompetence (Bell, 1994; Bell et al., 1996). The four subscales not only demonstrate high levels of internal consistency, ranging from .78 to .90, and split-half reliability from .78 to .90, but are free of response bias due to age, sex, or social desirability (Bell et al., 1986).

Alienation involves one's inability to achieve trust, closeness, and intimacy in relationships. Insecure Attachment, involves one's anxiety and excessive concern about being rejected in relationships. Egocentricity, involves the manipulation of others for one's own ego gratification. Social Incompetence, involves problems of shyness, absence of close relationships, and unsatisfactory sexual adjustment (Bell et al., 1986).

The four subscales of the BORI (Bell et al., 1984, 1985, 1986) were developed from a factor analysis with an oblique rotation on a former version of the measure that originally quantified a single Object Relations Score. The sample ($N = 336$) used to develop the BORI consisted of adult psychiatric inpatients (male and female) and undergraduate college students (male and female). Bell and colleagues (1986) replicated the study. A comparative analysis was conducted from the factor loadings obtained in the replicated study and the two data sets were combined. The data analysis show that Factors 1 to 4, the similarity coefficients for Alienation = .97, for Insecure Attachment = .90, for Egocentricity = .84, and for Social Incompetence = .93. The results suggest a high degree of factor invariance.

Cronbach's Coefficient Alphas are reported as .90 for Alienation (ALN), .82 for Insecure Attachment (IA), .78 for Egocentricity (Egc), .79 for Social Incompetence (SI);

Spearman Split-half are .90 for ALN, .81 for IA, .78 for Egc, and .82 for SI. Thus, Bell (1991) reported that the BORI's internal consistency and split-half reliability for the subscale consisted of a good to excellent range.

Test-retest reliability for the BORI was assessed by Bell and colleagues (1986) in a separate study on adult psychiatric inpatients during a range of 8, 13, and 26 weeks. Fluctuations in BORI scores existed with test-retest correlations being either too high or too low. The fluctuations appeared to be the result of the instructions of the BORI. The psychiatric patients who participated appeared to have had difficulty understanding the instructions to describe their most recent experience.

Validity of the BORI was established through a number of studies with varied population samples (Bell et al., 1986; Bell, Billington, Gibbons, & Cicchetti, 1988; Gibbons, 1984; Gibbs, 1989), subtypes of schizophrenia (Bell, Milstein, & Lysaker, 1991), substance abusers (Tatarsky, 1986), eating disorder (Becker, 1987, Becker, Bell, & Billington, 1987; Heesacker & Neimeyer, 1990, Weiner, 1990), nightmare sufferers (Hare, 1988), cross-dressers (Humphrey, 1989), and multiple personality disorders (Alpher, 1991); among normals in research of management behavior (Civin, 1987), mother-daughter dyads (Sarf, 1988), personalities of twins (Rosen, 1987), sexual decision making in college students (Randolph & Winstead, 1988), gender-identity formation (Simeone, 1987), single women who choose motherhood (Cerijido, 1990), and patterns of early adolescent relatedness to parents (DeSantis & Bell, 1987). The BORI has been established to be a psychometrically reliable and valid measure in assessing dimensions of object relations.

Bell (1995) has concluded that the BORI has proven to be a psychometrically reliable and valid instrument in measuring dimensions of object relations.

Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment - Revised (IPPA)

The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment - Revised (IPPA; Armsden & Greenberg, 1987) is an expanded version of the Inventory of Adolescent Attachments (Greenberg, Siegel, & Leitch, 1983). Both of these scales are theoretically derived from Bowlby's attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969, 1973, 1982, 1980; Sroufe & Waters, 1977), and measure two distinct dimensions of attachment: (a) felt security or the quality of affect toward significant others, and (b) proximity seeking or the utilization of attachment figures during times of emotional need (Greenberg et al., 1983; Armsden and Greenberg 1987).

The original measure obtained two attachment scores, one for the parent and one for the peer. The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment - Revised (IPPA) was designed to include items concerning attachment behavior, feelings regarding expectations of attachment relationships, and to provide three independent attachment scores. The revision resulted in an instrument that yields three scores: (a) attachment to mother (25-items), (b) attachment to father (25-items), and (c) attachment to peers (25-items). The revised version measures the "positive and negative affective and cognitive dimension of relationships with their parents and close friends, particularly how well these figures serve as sources of psychological security" (Armsden and Greenberg 1987, p.1, A9). It assesses three broad measures: degree of mutual trust, quality of communication, and extent of anger and alienation.

The IPPA examines the relationship between adolescents' connections to their families and their sense of well-being. After factor analysis, the measure yields four subscales with eigenvalues greater than 1. Positive scores on the dimensions are significantly related to two dependent criteria of well-being: self-esteem and life satisfaction.

The IPPA (1987) utilizes a Likert-scale consisting of five possible responses (1 = *almost never or never true* to 5 = *almost always or always true*). The instrument is scored by reverse-scoring the negatively worded items and then totaling the response measures in each section (Armsden and Greenberg, 1987; Fishler et al., 1990).

Initially, the IPPA was designed on two samples ($n = 93$, Spring 1981 and $n = 86$, Fall 1982) of undergraduates at the University of Washington. The college students who participated in the study came from mostly middle class families, and ranged in age from 16 to 20 years old, with a mean age of 18.9 years (Armsden and Greenberg, 1987; Fishler et al., 1990). In the development sample, 75% of the participants were Caucasian, and 63% were female (Armsden and Greenberg, 1987).

Results in the parent scale revealed that three principal elements (degree of mutual trust, quality of communication, and extent of anger and alienation) were established, each element with eigenvalues greater than 1, and as one accounting for 92% of the variance. Results revealed that degree of mutual trust (10-items) refers to felt security that one's emotional needs will be responded to with sensitivity and understanding by the attachment figure. Quality of communication (10-items) refers to the extent and quality of verbal interaction with the attachment. Finally, alienation refers

to insecure attachment manifested by anger toward or emotional detachment from attachment figures (Armsden and Greenberg, 1987).

The subscales were described as having a high degree of interrelatedness (Trust and Communication, $r = .76$; Trust and Alienation, $r = -.76$; Communication and Alienation, $r = -.70$) indicating that the three elements are not as independent as measured by the factor analysis (Armsden and Greenberg, 1987). The three elements were recorded as a block to illustrate parental attachment due to the probable multicollinearity among the parental dimensions (Armsden and Greenberg, 1987; Lapsley, Rice, & Fitzgerald, 1990). Samples of elements from the three dimensions include: *Parent Trust*, "My mother accepts me as I am"; *Parent Communication*, "I like to get my father's point of view on things that I am concerned about"; *Parent Alienation*, "I get upset easily at home" (Armsden and Greenberg, 1987).

The IPPA has shown significant reliability and good potential validity to assess the perceived quality of close relationships in late adolescence. This measure appears to have excellent psychometric properties. The Cronbach's coefficient alphas for the parent measure, trust factor and communication factor are all .91, and for alienation factor is .86. It is important to note that the BORI's Cronbach coefficient alpha for alienation factor is .90. In a study, with a sample of 27, 18 to 20 year olds, internal consistency and test-retest reliabilities (3 week) for the parent attachment measure is .93 and for peer attachment is .86. For the revised version internal reliabilities and Cronbach's coefficient alphas are: Mother attachment = .87; and Father attachment = .89 and peer attachment .92 (Armsden and Greenberg, 1987).

In another study, with a sample of 86 late adolescents (17 to 20 years) Armsden and Greenberg (1987) measured the validity of the IPPA. In this study, the score distribution was divided into three classification designs (high, medium and low security). Each participant was ranked accordingly.

These groups were given the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS) to measure psychological well-being. The Family Environment Scale (FES) was given to measure family environment. The Family and Peer Utilization Scales from Inventory of Adolescent Attachment (IAA) was given to measure support from significant others, and the Bachman's Affective Status Index was given to measure affective status. The scores for parental attachment showed moderate to high correlation to Family and Social Self scores from the TSCS and to the majority of subscales on the FES (Armsden and Greenberg, 1987). Data on the IPPA have also been found to be related to various personality elements. The results show that the quality of attachment was positively correlated with psychological well being. Highly secure attached adolescents showed significantly less symptomatology (e.g., less depressed, anxious, resentment/alienation, covert anger, loneliness, and guilt). Thus highly secure attached adolescents are more positively correlated with one's stability and self-esteem and life-satisfaction, and more likely to look for social support than low security attached students according to Armsden and Greenberg. Results of the high and low security parent attachment groups showed that the high security parent attachment group was significantly dissimilar on all dimensions except for Guilt (Affective Status Index) and Peer Utilization (Inventory of Adolescent Attachment) than the low security group ($p < .05$ to $p < .01$) (Armsden 1986, Armsden and Greenberg, 1987).

Results of other studies validated these findings. In a study of psychiatric patients (10 to 16 year-olds) less secure parent attachment was associated with a clinical diagnosis of depression, parent rating of the patient, and adolescent's self-disclosed state of depression (Armsden, McCauley, Greenberg, Burke, & Mitchell, 1991). A study of 12 to 17 year-olds (Redondo, Martin, Fernandez, & Lopez, 1986) reported that attachment to parents discriminated between delinquents and non-delinquents. Armsden (1986) found that less loneliness and less conflict between parents and late adolescents were correlated with more secure attachment to parents.

Relationship Experience Scale (RES)

The Relationship Experience Scale (RES) is a 56-item measure developed by Cooke (1996) to assess relationship experiences in college students. Cooke's approach is based on attachment literature.

The RES was validated using 302 undergraduate psychology students (freshmen and sophomores) at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill which included a subset sample ($n = 38$) to obtain feedback about unanticipated problems on the measure. Changes were then made to the measure. The RES (revised version) was then administered to the additional students ($n = 264$). The overall sample ($N = 302$) was predominantly middle class with a mean age of 19.25 years (72.5% female; 27.5% male). Their ethnic background included 80% Caucasian, 10% African-American, 5% Asian-American, 2% Hispanic, and 2% as multiracial or other. The participants were 31% freshmen and 39% sophomores with a history of involvement in an average of four romantic relationships, of which fewer than two were considered serious. The total

number of relationships ranged from 1 to 25, but 98% reported having been involved in ten or fewer relationships. The mean length of the students' longest relationship was about two years, and the mean length of the most recent romantic relationship was one and a half years.

Originally, the RES consisted of 56 statements about the participant's most recent serious romantic relationship designed to fit with a set of twelve dimensions that draw upon key qualities of romantic relationship: acceptance/tolerance of partner, acceptance/tolerance by partner, trust in depth and stability of partner's feelings, liking and respect for partner, commitment, jealousy, intimacy and ability to open up with partner, constructive conflict management, boundaries, satisfaction, power balance, and passion or caring for partner. Items were factor analyzed using a principal component extraction technique with an oblique rotation. Oblique rotation was used in order to maximize the eventuality of acquiring significant factors by letting them correlate with each other. The initial phase of Cooke's (1996) study concentrated on the instrument's validation. Thus an unlimited factor solution was examined, along with an established twelve-factor, six-factor, and five-factor pattern matrix solutions. Results suggest that the five-factor solution is the most useful because it is both simple and interpretable. In comparison to the other solutions the five-factor pattern did not manufacture one, two, or three item factors and the solutions were similar. Additionally, the common link between each factor was easily conceptualized.

Titles were selected which seemed to best describe the central or prevailing theme of the items in each factor. Cooke (1996) reported factor intercorrelations to be Liking/Respect (LR) and Negativity = .63, Liking/Respect and Trust in Partner's

Devotion = .57, Liking/Respect and Intimate Disclosure = .68, Liking/Respect and Emotional Attachment = .76, Negativity and Trust in Partner's Devotion = .52, Negativity and Intimate Disclosure = .58, Negativity and Emotional Attachment = .54, Trust in Partner's Devotion and Intimate Disclosure = .61, Trust in Partner's Devotion and Emotional Attachment = .46, Intimate Disclosure and Emotional Attachment = .65. Item loadings ranged from .27 to .84 on the five gathered factors.

The RES has five dimensions: (1) liking/respect, (2) negativity, (3) trust in partner's decision, (4) intimate disclosure, and (5) emotional/attachment. The appendix included statements concerning the participant's most recent serious romantic relationship, one lasting three months or longer (past or present). All items are coded during scoring such that 5 = *best* and 1 = *worst*.

Each of the five factors had eigenvalues greater than 1.0, and together accounted for 50.4% of the total variance (Cooke, 1996). According to Cooke, the remaining variance (49.6%) may be the result of other unselected factors and to the unrivaled variance of the individual items: Factor 1 (Liking/Respect; LR) with an eigenvalue of 19.31 accounted for 43.5% of the total variance, Factor 2 (Negativity; NEG) with an eigenvalue of 3.94 accounted for 7%, Factor 3 (Trust in Partner's Devotion; TPD) with an eigenvalue of 2.54 accounted for 4.5%, Factor 4 (Intimate Disclosure; ID) with an eigenvalue of 1.38 accounted for 2.55, and Factor 5 (Emotional Attachment; EA) with an eigenvalue of 1.04 accounted for 1.9%.

Cooke (1996) reported that the preliminary evaluations of the newly developed instrument seem to support its basic integrity. Cronbach's coefficient alphas and split-half reliability are reported as .96 and .95 for the relationship experience scale; .85 and

.83 for the liking/respect factor; .87 and .85 for the negativity factor; .84 and .80 for the trust in partner's devotion factor; .87 and .83 for the intimate disclosure factor; and .92 and .91 for the emotional attachment factor. Cronbach's coefficient alphas for each factor ranged from .84 to .92, with a mean of .87. Spearman-Brown split-half reliabilities ranged from .80 to .91, with a mean of .84.

The RES is designed to assess one's quality of relationship experiences. It is as an indirect measure of actual relationship behavior within the confines of a specific type and instance of adult relatedness. The instrument was found to have excellent internal consistency and split-half reliability. The RES subscales (Liking/Respect, Negativity, Trust in Partner's Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment) also demonstrated adequate reliability and convergent validity with measures of object relations. The RES presents as a valid and reliable criterion measure of relationship experiences (Cooke, 1996).

Continuity and Integration of Self Scale (CISS)

The Continuity and Integration of Self Scale is a 30-item self-report measure that Wiss (1991) developed to measure the participant's sense of internal stability and integration of different aspects of their identity. The CISS utilizes a four point Likert-scale in which items are responded to on a continuum ranging from 1 = *strongly agree* to 4 = *strongly disagree*. All items are coded during scoring such that 4 = *best* and 1 = *worst* and lower scores on the CISS indicate greater continuity (Wiss, 1991).

In the initial study, Wiss (1991) administered the CISS to a sample of 83 of undergraduate students enrolled in introductory psychology at the University of

Michigan. The sample consisted of thirty-nine men and forty-four women, with a mean age of 18.65. The results of the data indicated that the items of the scale had an internal consistency reliability of .88. However, the data did not show significant changes in pattern of correlations with other criteria when the effects of gender were controlled. Research indicates that the CISS demonstrated strong correlations with other measures of self-concept and self-esteem: Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS), Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE), and Relationship Experience Scale (RES), and with the Bell Object Relations Scale (BORI).

The CISS (Wiss, 1991) is highly correlated with all TSCS subscales (including variability) and with the RSE ($r = .63$). These findings suggest considerable "overlap between continuity and integrity of self and self-esteem" (p. 65). As proposed by Wiss (1991) the correlation of the CISS and the variability subscale of the TSCS offer tentative validation of the construct validity of the CISS.

Cooke's (1996) study found significant correlations with the CISS and all four BORI subscales. In addition, three subscales (Alienation, Insecure Attachment, and Egocentricity) maintained significant correlations even after the effects of the RSE were partialled out. Cooke additionally found a parallel pattern between the CISS and a measure of psychiatric symptomatology. Originally, the CISS provided significant correlations with all nine of the SCL-90-R subscales, when the effects of the RES were controlled; significant correlations continued with seven of the nine SCL-90-R subscales except for the Hostility and Phobic Anxiety subscale. Wiss (1991) found the CISS to be a valid and reliable instrument.

The CISS (Wiss, 1991) showed strong correlations with the TSCS and RSE, and RES and BORI (Cooke, 1996) which suggest that continuity and integration of self is a valid and significant view of self.

Demographic and Background Information Self-Report

The Demographic and Background Information Self-Report was administered to obtain basic demographic material (e.g., age, gender, year in college, and ethnic origin). Other information requested included the participant's history of relationships (e.g., number of romantic relationships in which the participant had been involved in the past, the number of those relationships that were considered "serious," the number of relationships that lasted three months or longer, the duration of their longest relationship, and the duration of their most recent relationship).

Design

This study was designed to examine the relationships between the independent variables: object relations functioning, attachment security, and continuity and integration of self and the dependent variable of adult relatedness.

In this study there are six hypotheses:

1. Participants who report positive levels of Liking and Respect in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self.

2. Participants who report positive levels of Trust in Partner's Devotion in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self.

3. Participants who report positive levels of Intimate Disclosure in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self.

4. Participants who report positive levels of Emotional Attachment in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self.

5. Participants who report positive levels of Negativity in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self.

6. There are gender differences on the Adult Relatedness, Object Relations, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self variables.

In Hypothesis 1 to 5, there are multiple continuous criterion and predictor variables. The criterion variable, adult relatedness consists of five subscales (Liking/Respect, Negativity, Trust in Partners Decision, Intimate Disclosure, and Emotional/Attachment). The predictor variables are object relations functioning, attachment security, and self-representations. Object relations functioning consists of four subscales (Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, and Social Incompetence). Attachment security consists of three subscales, but for this study two subscales will be considered (Mother, Father). Continuity and Integration of Self consists of a single subscale which addresses the individual's sense of internal stability and

integration of disparate aspects of their identity. There are a total of twelve variables in Hypotheses: 1 to 5.

In Hypothesis 6, there is a single categorical independent variable gender, and multiple continuous dependent variables; all are subscales of object relations functioning, attachment security, self-representations, and adult relatedness.

Statistical Analysis

Frequency distributions for each demographic variable were compiled, listing the number, percent, and Cumulative percent, where applicable. Pearson correlation was used to examine the relationships between the research variables: object relations functioning, attachment security, continuity and integration of self, and adult relatedness.

Stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to analyze the hypotheses.

Regression analysis is a statistical technique that allows for examination of the relationship between a dependent variable and one or more independent variables. Multiple regression analysis is an extension of bivariate correlation analysis in that several independent variables can be combined to predict the values of a dependent variable, thus creating the multiple correlation that expresses the magnitude of the relationship between multiple independent variables and a dependent variable.

Stepwise multiple regression analysis is a regression technique that facilitates the identification of those independent variables that are significantly related to the dependent variable. In stepwise regression analysis, the independent variables are scanned to identify the one that has the strongest relationship with the dependent variable. This is the first variable selected for inclusion in the regression equation. In the

following steps, the remaining variables are scanned and the next variable selected is the one which will result in the largest significant increase in the multiple correlation. This process is continued until the remaining independent variables are incapable of resulting in a significant increase in the multiple correlation, or all variables are entered into the regression equation. Should regression processing stop and some variables remain unselected, these are the variables that do not account for unique variance with the dependent variable, that is not already explained by independent variables in the equation.

To analyze these hypotheses, 5 separate regression analyses were conducted, one for each component of adult relatedness (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partner's Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, and Negativity). In each regression, the adult relatedness component was the dependent variable, and the object relations scales (Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence), Attachment Security scales (IPPA Mother, IPPA Father) and the Continuity and Integration of Self scale scores were the independent variables.

Prior to conducting the regression analyses, the data were evaluated to examine the extent to which they conform to the regression analysis assumptions. The assumptions included normality, multicollinearity, and outliers.

Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) is used to examine Hypothesis 6, because there is a single categorical independent variable (gender), and there are multiple continuous dependent variables (object relations functioning, attachment security, self-representations, and adult relatedness). MANOVA is the preferred statistical technique to use to analyze group differences on multiple dependent variables that are correlated.

Given the significant relationships indicated in Table 19, MANOVA was used to analyze this hypothesis.

Prior to conducting the MANOVA, the data were evaluated to insure conformance to the assumptions necessary to have a valid test. The assumptions included multivariate normality, outliers, linearity, homogeneity of variance, and multicollinearity. Adjustments were made for outliers. All other assumptions were satisfactory except homogeneity of variance (Box's $M = 105.44$, $p = .03$). As a result, Pillai's criterion was used to evaluate multivariate significance, as this method is less sensitive to violations of this assumption (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989, p. 379).

A power analysis was conducted to ensure that an adequate sample size was found for the analyses conducted. Assuming a medium effect size and an alpha level of .05, 102 participants were required for the regressions and 64 participants were required for the ANOVAs for power at .80. This participant pool by far surpassed the power requirements (Cohen, 1992).

Chapter IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the statistical analyses that were used to examine the hypotheses in this study. The chapter begins with a presentation of basic descriptive statistics on the demographic variable and the main research variables. This is followed by the results of hypothesis testing.

Demographics

Three hundred forty participants participated in this study of which 192 were females (56.5%) and 148 were males (43.5%). A frequency distribution on the participants' ages is presented in Table 1. The ages ranged from 17 to 20, and most participants were either 18 (43.8%) or 19 (33.5%). The mean age was 18.65 years old.

Table 1

Frequency Distribution on Age

Age	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
17.00	15	4.4	4.4
18.00	149	43.8	48.2
19.00	114	33.5	81.8
20.00	62	18.2	100.0
Total	340	100.0	

Table 2 shows a frequency distribution on current year in college. The participants were represented by Freshmen (51.8%) and Sophomores (48.2%).

Table 2

Current Year in College

Year	Frequency	Percent
Freshman	176	51.8
Sophomore	164	48.2
Total	340	100.0

Table 3 presents a frequency distribution on the Participants' marital status. Only 2 participants (.6%) were married.

Table 3

Marital Status

	Frequency	Percent
Single	338	99.4
Married	2	.6
Total	340	100.0

A frequency distribution on the participants' ethnicity is presented in Table 4. Most participants were White/Caucasian (63.5%). The participants also included African-Americans(13.8%), Hispanics (12.4%), Asians (6.2%), and other ethnicities not specifically identified (4.1%).

Table 4

Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Frequency	Percent
African-American/ African/Caribbean/ Black	47	13.8

Ethnicity	Frequency	Percent
Caucasian/White	216	63.5
Hispanic	42	12.4
Asian American/ Pacific Islander	21	6.2
Other	14	4.1
Total	340	100.0

The participants' religious backgrounds are presented in Table 5. Most participants were Catholic (64.7%). Other religions not specifically indicated represented 15.3% of the participants and Protestants included 8.8%. Other categories with 5.0% or less included no religion (5.0%), Jewish 1.5%), Muslims (1.5%), Hindus (2.1%), and Buddhists (1.2%).

Table 5

<i>Religious Background</i>	Frequency	Percent
Protestant	30	8.8
Catholic	220	64.7
Jewish	5	1.5
Muslim	5	1.5
Hindu	7	2.1
Buddhist	4	1.2
Other	52	15.3
None	17	5.0
Total	340	100.0

A frequency distribution on the marital status of the participants' parents is presented in Table 6. Most participants indicated that their parents are married (70.0%). Fewer participants indicated that their parents are divorced (17.4%), never married (4.7%), separated (4.1%), or widowed (3.8%).

Table 6

Parent's Marital Status

	Frequency	Percent
Married	238	70.0
Separated	14	4.1
Divorced	59	17.4
Widowed	13	3.8
Never Married	16	4.7
Total	340	100.0

Table 7 shows information on who raised the participants. Most participants were raised by both parents (78.5%). Some participants were raised by their mothers (9.4%), their fathers (.6%), by one parent and a relative (3.2%), by relatives (.6%), or by some other person (2.1%).

Table 7

By Whom Were You Raised?

	Frequency	Percent
Both parents	267	78.5
Mother only	32	9.4
Father only	2	.6
One parent and other relative	11	3.2
Other relative only	2	.6
If parents are divorced, did you see non-custodial parent	19	5.6
Other	7	2.1
Total	340	100.0

The participants' perceptions of the quality of their parents' marriages is presented in Table 8. Most participants indicated that their parents' marriages were either very good (43.2%) or good (18.5%). However, some Participants indicated that the marriages were fair/average (14.7%), poor (5.6%), or very poor (17.9%).

Table 8

Parent's Quality of Marriage

	Frequency	Percent
Very good	147	43.2
Good	63	18.5
Fair/ Average	50	14.7
Poor	19	5.6
Very poor	61	17.9
Total	340	100.0

Table 9 presents a frequency distribution on the Participants' siblings. The number of siblings ranged from 0 (11.2%) to 11 (.3%). Most Participants had 1 (37.9%) or 2 (33.2%) siblings. The mean number of siblings was 1.80.

Table 9

How Many Siblings Were You Raised With?

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
.00	38	11.2	11.2
1.00	129	37.9	49.1
2.00	113	33.2	82.4
3.00	33	9.7	92.1
4.00	10	2.9	95.0
5.00	6	1.8	96.8
6.00	2	.6	97.4
7.00	3	.9	98.2
8.00	2	.6	98.8
9.00	1	.3	99.1
10.00	2	.6	99.7
11.00	1	.3	100.0
Total	340	100.0	

The participant's birth order is presented in Table 10. Most participants were either the oldest (37.1%) or the youngest (36.5%). Fewer participants were middle children (17.4%) or only children (9.1%).

Table 10

Birth Order

	Frequency	Percent
Only child	31	9.1
Oldest	126	37.1
Middle Range	59	17.4
Youngest	124	36.5
Total	340	100.0

Table 11 presents information on where the participants live. Most participants live with their parents (66.2%), and about 1/3 of the participants did not live with their parents (33.8%).

Table 11

Do You Reside With Your Parents?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	225	66.2
No	115	33.8
Total	340	100.0

A frequency distribution on the Participants' family income is presented in Table 12. Most participants (38.5%) indicated that their family income was over \$79,000 per year.

Table 12

Family Income

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
under 25k	27	7.9	7.9
25-35k	35	10.3	18.2
36-45k	42	12.4	30.6
46-55k	56	16.5	47.1
56-70k	49	14.4	61.5
over 79k	131	38.5	100.0
Total	340	100.0	

Tables 13 through 17 present frequency distributions on the participants' relationship experiences. Most participants (90.6%) had been in 6 or less romantic relationships, and most participants (95.6%) had been in 3 or less serious romantic relationships. Most participants (93.8%) indicated that they were in 4 or fewer relationships for more than 3 months. The mean for the longest relationship was 18.26 months and the mean for the longest serious relationship was 15.03 months.

Table 13

How Many Romantic Relationships Have You Been In?

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
.00	7	2.1	2.1
1.00	73	21.5	23.5
2.00	93	27.4	50.9
3.00	58	17.1	67.9
4.00	39	11.5	79.4
5.00	28	8.2	87.6
6.00	10	2.9	90.6
7.00	11	3.2	93.8
8.00	5	1.5	95.3
10.00	9	2.6	97.9
12.00	4	1.2	99.1
13.00	1	.3	99.4
14.00	1	.3	99.7
15.00	1	.3	100.0
Total	340	100.0	

Table 14

How Many of Your Past and Current Relationships Have Been Serious?

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
.00	35	10.3	10.3
1.00	175	51.5	61.8
2.00	90	26.5	88.2
3.00	25	7.4	95.6
4.00	8	2.4	97.9
5.00	2	.6	98.5
6.00	1	.3	98.8
7.00	1	.3	99.1
8.00	1	.3	99.4
10.00	2	.6	100.0
Total	340	100.0	

Table 15

How Many Partners Have You Been With that were 3 Months or Longer?

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
.00	25	7.4	7.4
1.00	138	40.6	47.9
2.00	91	26.8	74.7
3.00	43	12.6	87.4
4.00	22	6.5	93.8
5.00	6	1.8	95.6
6.00	6	1.8	97.4
7.00	1	.3	97.6
8.00	3	.9	98.5
10.00	3	.9	99.4
14.00	1	.3	99.7
15.00	1	.3	100.0
Total	340	100.0	

Table 16

How Long Was the Longest Relationship in Months?

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
.00	7	2.1	2.1
1.00	5	1.5	3.5
2.00	7	2.1	5.6
3.00	7	2.1	7.6
3.50	1	.3	7.9
4.00	12	3.5	11.5
5.00	10	2.9	14.4
6.00	17	5.0	19.4
7.00	8	2.4	21.8
8.00	17	5.0	26.8
9.00	8	2.4	29.1
10.00	7	2.1	31.2
11.00	4	1.2	32.4
12.00	50	14.7	47.1
12.50	1	.3	47.4
13.00	6	1.8	49.1
14.00	3	.9	50.0
15.00	10	2.9	52.9
16.00	4	1.2	54.1
17.00	2	.6	54.7
18.00	24	7.1	61.8
20.00	3	.9	62.6
21.00	4	1.2	63.8
24.00	50	14.7	78.5
25.00	1	.3	78.8
27.00	1	.3	79.1
28.00	1	.3	79.4
29.00	1	.3	79.7
30.00	21	6.2	85.9
32.00	1	.3	86.2
34.00	1	.3	86.5
36.00	19	5.6	92.1
38.00	1	.3	92.4
39.00	1	.3	92.6
42.00	5	1.5	94.1
48.00	12	3.5	97.6
54.00	2	.6	98.2
60.00	5	1.5	99.7
72.00	1	.3	100.0
Total	340	100.0	

Table 17

How Long Has or Did Your Most Serious Relationship Last in Months?

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
.00	14	4.1	4.1
1.00	11	3.2	7.4
2.00	17	5.0	12.4
3.00	14	4.1	16.5
3.50	1	.3	16.8
4.00	16	4.7	21.5
4.50	1	.3	21.8
5.00	15	4.4	26.2
6.00	13	3.8	30.0
7.00	10	2.9	32.9
8.00	20	5.9	38.8
9.00	9	2.6	41.5
10.00	8	2.4	43.8
11.00	2	.6	44.4
12.00	40	11.8	56.2
12.50	1	.3	56.5
13.00	7	2.1	58.5
14.00	5	1.5	60.0
15.00	9	2.6	62.6
16.00	7	2.1	64.7
17.00	2	.6	65.3
18.00	23	6.8	72.1
20.00	3	.9	72.9
21.00	3	.9	73.8
22.00	1	.3	74.1
24.00	37	10.9	85.0
25.00	1	.3	85.3
27.00	1	.3	85.6
28.00	1	.3	85.9
29.00	1	.3	86.2
30.00	14	4.1	90.3
32.00	1	.3	90.6
34.00	1	.3	90.9
36.00	12	3.5	94.4
38.00	1	.3	94.7
39.00	1	.3	95.0
42.00	2	.6	95.6
48.00	7	2.1	97.6
54.00	2	.6	98.2
60.00	5	1.5	99.7
72.00	1	.3	100.0
Total	340	100.0	

Table 18 presents the means and standard deviations for the continuous demographic variables and the key research variables included in this study.

Table 18

Means and Standard deviations on Demographic and Research Variables

Variable	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age	1700	2000	18.65	.82
How many siblings were you raised?	00	1100	1.80	1.56
Relationship Experience A: How many romantic relationships have you been in?	00	1500	3.19	2.49
Relationship Experience B: How many of your past and current relationships have been serious?	00	1000	1.50	1.23
Relationship Experience C: How many partners have you been with that were 3 months or longer?	00	1500	2.03	1.84
Relationship Experience D: How long was the longest relationship (months)?	00	7200	18.26	13.36
Relationship Experience E: How long has or did your most serious relationship last (months)?	00	7200	15.03	12.99
BORI: Alienation Subscale	3000	8000	52.09	9.27
BORI: Insecure Attachment Subscale	3000	7900	52.82	9.25
BORI: Egocentricity Subscale	3000	7900	51.76	9.87
BORI: Social Incompetence Subscale	3000	7300	49.34	10.13
CISS total score	3500	9900	65.83	11.78
RES Liking/Respect	700	2900	12.22	4.54
RES Negativity	1600	5200	31.80	7.05
RES Trust In Partner's Devotion	900	4100	22.50	7.26
RES Intimate Disclosure	1000	4700	23.55	8.00
RES Emotional Attachment	2400	7600	44.21	10.99
IPPAMMOTH	4400	9500	74.15	8.83
IPPAMFATH	2600	10300	68.46	11.13

Table 19 presents a matrix of Pearson correlation coefficients between the research variables.

The relationships in this table show the following:

1. The Adult Relatedness variables are intercorrelated with each other, and have significant relationships with the CISS and BORI scales
2. The attachment Security scales (IPPA Mother and IPPA Father) were unrelated to all variables
3. The CISS variable was significantly related to the Adult Relatedness variables and the BORI scales
4. The BORI scales demonstrated significant relationships with all variables except the attachment security variables.

Table 20 presents the Cronbachs Alpha reliability coefficients for the scales.

Table 20

Cronbachs Alpha Reliability Coefficients

Variable	Reliability		
Liking/Respect	.85		
Negativity	.71		
Trust in Partners Devotion	.82		
Intimate Disclosure	.86		
Emotional Attachment	.84		
CISS	.86		
Attachment Security Mother*	.70		
Attachment Security Father*	.73		

Note. *Questions 6, 9, and 23 deleted to improve reliability

Analysis of Hypotheses

Stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to analyze the hypotheses.

Regression analysis is a statistical technique that allows an examination of the relationship between a dependent variable and one or more independent variables. Multiple regression analysis is an extension of bivariate correlation analysis in that several independent variables can be combined to predict the values of a dependent variable, thus creating the multiple correlation that expresses the magnitude of the relationship between multiple independent variables and a dependent variable.

Stepwise multiple regression analysis is a regression technique that facilitates the identification of those independent variables that are significantly related to the dependent variable. In stepwise regression analysis, the independent variables are scanned to identify the one that has the strongest relationship with the dependent variable.

This is the first variable selected for inclusion in the regression equation. In the following steps, the remaining variables are scanned and the next variable selected is the one which will result in the largest significant increase in the multiple correlation. This process is continued until the remaining independent variables are incapable of resulting in a significant increase in the multiple correlation, or all variables are entered into the regression equation. Should regression processing stop and some variables remain unselected, they are the variables that do not account for unique variance with the dependent variable, that is, not already explained by independent variables in the equation.

To analyze these hypotheses five separate regression analyses were conducted, one for each component of Adult Relatedness (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partner's Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, and Negativity). In each regression, the Adult Relatedness component was the dependent variable, and the Object Relations scales (Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence), Attachment Security scales (IPPA Mother, IPPA Father) and the Continuity and Integration of Self scale scores were the independent variables.

Prior to conducting the regression analyses, the data were evaluated to examine the extent to which they conform to the regression analysis assumptions. The assumptions included normality and absence of multicollinearity, and outliers. All assumptions were satisfactory except outliers on the attachment scales. One outlier was found on mother attachment where a score was converted from 44 to 47.66 at the third standard deviation. Two outliers were found on father attachment. A score of 103 was

converted to the third standard deviation, 101.85. Also, a score of 26 was converted to the third standard deviation, 35.07.

The results of each regression analysis are presented below.

Hypothesis 1

Participants who demonstrate positive levels of Liking and Respect in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self.

The regression analysis for Liking/Respect is presented in Table 21. These results show that the object relations alienation scale entered on the first step, correlating .40 with Liking/Respect. The object relations insecure attachment scores entered on the second step, increasing the multiple correlation to .42. Together, Alienation and Insecure Attachment explained 18% of the variance in Liking/Respect. The Object Relations variables of Egocentricity and Social Incompetence, as well as the Attachment Security variables and Continuity and Integration of Self failed to enter, which indicates that these variables did not account for unique variance in Liking/Respect.

Table 21

Stepwise Multiple Regression Results: Hypothesis 1

Step	Variable	Standardized Beta	Sig	F	Df	Sig.	R	R ²	R ² ch	Fch	Sig
1	Alienation	.40	.001	65.09	1,338	.001	.40	.16			
2	Alienation Insecure Attach	.46 -.13	.001 .01	35.90	2,337	.001	.42	.18	.02	5.78	.01

The beta coefficients indicate that participants with high scores on Liking/Respect, showing greater levels of liking and respect for their partners, tended to show more alienation and less insecure attachment.

According to Cohen (1992, p. 157) the multiple correlation in excess of .35 constitutes a large effect size. In the current study .42 constitutes a large effect size.

Hypothesis 2

Participants who demonstrate positive levels of Trust in Partners Devotion in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self. The regression results for Trust in Partner's Devotion are presented in Table 22.

Table 22

Stepwise Multiple Regression Results: Hypothesis 2

Step	Variable	Standardized Beta	Sig.	F	Df	Sig.	R	R ²	R ² ch	Fch	Sig.
1	Alienation	.46	.001	91.23	1,338	.001	.46	.21			
2	Alienation CISS	.37 .18	.001 .001	52.51	2,337	.001	.49	.24	.03	11.07	.001

Table 22 shows that the Object Relations Alienation scale entered on the first step, correlating .46 with Trust in Partner's Devotion. The Continuity and Integration of Self scores entered on the second step, increasing the multiple correlation to .49. Together, Alienation and Continuity and Integration of Self accounted for 24% of the variance in Trust in Partner's Devotion. The Object Relations variables of Insecure

Attachment, Egocentricity and Social Incompetence, as well as Attachment Security variables failed to enter, which indicates that these variables did not account for unique variance in Trust in Partner's Devotion.

The beta coefficients indicate that participants with high scores on Trust in Partner's Devotion, showing greater levels of trust with their partners, tended to show more alienation and less integration of self.

According to Cohen (1992) the multiple correlation in excess of .35 constitutes a large effect size. In the current study .49 constitutes a large effect size.

Hypothesis 3

Participants who demonstrate positive levels of Intimate Disclosure in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self. The regression results for Intimate Disclosure are presented in Table 23.

Table 23

Stepwise Multiple Regression Results: Hypothesis 3

Step	Variable	Standard-ized Beta	Sig	F	Df	Sig.	R	R ²	R ² ch	Fch	Sig
1	Alienation	.51	.001	124.66	1,338	.001	.52	.27			
2	Alienation CISS	.43 .17	.001 .001	69.49	2,337	.001	.54	.29	.02	10.73	.001
3	Alienation CISS Attach - Mother	.41 .16 -.12	.001 .002 .005	49.86	3,336	.001	.56	.31	.02	7.86	.005

Table 23 shows that the object relations alienation scale entered on the first step, correlating .52 with Intimate Disclosure. The Continuity and Integration of Self scores entered on the second step, increasing the multiple correlation to .54. Attachment Security (IPPA Mother) entered on the third step, increasing the multiple correlation to .56. Together, Alienation, Continuity and Integration of Self, Attachment Security (IPPA Mother) accounted for 31% of the variance in Intimate Disclosure. The object relations variables of insecure attachment, egocentricity and Social Incompetence, as well as the Attachment Security (IPPA Father) failed to enter, which indicates that these variables did not account for unique variance in Intimate Disclosure.

The beta coefficients indicate that participants with high scores on Intimate Disclosure, showing greater willingness to engage in intimate self disclosure, tended to show more alienation and less integration, and less secure attachment to their mothers.

According to Cohen (1992) the multiple correlation in excess of .35 constitutes a large effect size. In the current study .31 constitutes a medium effect size.

Hypothesis 4

Participants who demonstrate positive levels of Emotional Attachment in their relationships will have healthy object relations functioning, mother and father attachment, and continuity and integration of their self. The regression results for Emotional Attachment are presented in Table 24.

Table 24

Stepwise Multiple Regression Results: Hypothesis 4

Step	Variable	Standard- ized Beta	Sig	F	Df	Sig.	R	R ²	R ² ch	Fch	Sig
1	Alienation	.40	.001	65.03	1,338	.001	.40	.16			

Table 24 shows that the object relations alienation scale entered on the first step, correlating .40 with Emotional Attachment. Alienation accounted for 16% of the variance in Emotional Attachment. The object relations variables of Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity and Social Incompetence, as well as the Attachment Security variables and Continuity and Integration of Self failed to enter, which indicates that these variables did not account for unique variance in Emotional Attachment.

The beta coefficient indicates that participants with high scores on Emotional Attachment, showing greater levels of commitment and devotion to the relationship, tended to show more alienation.

According to Cohen (1992) the multiple correlation in excess of .35 constitutes a large effect size. In the current study .40 constitutes a large effect size.

Hypothesis 5

Participants who demonstrate high levels of Negativity in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self. The regression results for Negativity are presented in Table 25.

Table 25

Stepwise Multiple Regression Results: Hypothesis 5

Step	Variable	Standard- ized Beta	Sig	F	Df	Sig.	R	R ²	R ² ch	Fch	Sig
1	Alienation	.36	.001	51.16	1,338	.001	.36	.13			
2	Alienation Egocentric ity	.31 .14	.001 .005	30.05	2,337	.001	.39	.15	.02	7.89	.005

Table 25 shows that the object relations alienation scale entered on the first step, correlating .36 with Negativity. The object relations egocentricity scores entered on the second step, increasing the multiple correlation to .39. Together, Alienation and Egocentricity accounted for 15% of the variance in Negativity. The object relations variables of Insecure Attachment and Social Incompetence, as well as Attachment Security and Continuity and Integration of Self failed to enter, which indicates that these variables did not account for unique variance in Negativity.

The beta coefficients indicate that participants with high scores on Negativity, showing less frequent disagreements and negative communications styles, tended to show more alienation and egocentricity.

According to Cohen (1992) the multiple correlation in excess of .35 constitutes a large effect size. In the current study .39 constitutes a large effect size.

Hypothesis 6

There are gender differences on the Adult Relatedness, Object Relations, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self variables.

Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) is the preferred statistical technique to use to analyze group differences on multiple dependent variables that are correlated. Given the significant relationships indicated in Table 19, MANOVA was used to analyze this hypothesis.

Prior to conducting the MANOVA, the data were evaluated to insure conformance to the assumptions necessary to have a valid test. The assumptions included multivariate normality, outliers, linearity, homogeneity of variance, and multicollinearity. Outliers were adjusted as indicated previously. All other assumptions were satisfactory except homogeneity of variance (Box's $M=105.44$, $p = .03$). As a result, Pillai's criterion was used to evaluate multivariate significance, as this method is less sensitive to violations of this assumption (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1989, p.379).

The multivariate F indicates that significant differences were indeed found between the males and females on the dependent variables [$F(12,327)=3.94$, $p=.001$]. The univariate F tests, presented below in Table 26, show that significant differences were found on Liking/Respect, Intimate Disclosure, Father Attachment, Object Relations Insecure Attachment and Social Incompetence.

Table 26

Univariate Analysis of Variance: Hypothesis 6

Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
RES liking/respect	111.381	1,338	111.381	5.469	.02
RES negativity	7.062	1,338	7.062	.141	.70
RES trust in partner's devotion	70.941	1,338	70.941	1.346	.24
RES intimate disclosure	326.400	1,338	326.400	5.158	.02
RES emotional attachment	280.910	1,338	280.910	2.332	.12
CISS total score	15.833	1,338	15.833	.114	.73
IPAMMOTH	1.013	1,338	1.013	.013	.91
IPAMFATH	935.778	1,338	935.778	7.701	.006
BORI: Alienation Subscale	135.696	1,338	135.696	1.580	.21
BORI: Insecure Attachment Subscale	716.757	1,338	716.757	8.549	.004
BORI: Egocentricity Subscale	284.719	1,338	284.719	2.937	.08
BORI: Social Incompetence Subscale	471.424	1,338	471.424	4.639	.03

The means and standard deviations by gender are presented below in Table 27. These results show the following:

1. Liking/Respect – The mean of 12.87 for the males was significantly higher than the mean of 11.72 for the females.
2. Intimate Disclosure – The mean of 24.66 for the males was significantly higher than the mean of 22.69 for the females.
3. Father Attachment – The mean of 70.35 for the males was significantly higher than the mean of 67 for the females.
4. Object Relations Insecure Attachment – The mean of 54.10 for the females was significantly higher than the mean of 51.17 for the males.
5. Object Relations Social Incompetence – The mean of 50.37 for the females was significantly higher than the mean of 48.00 for the males.

Table 27

Means and Standard Deviations: Hypothesis 6

Variable	sex	Mean	Std. Deviation
RES liking/respect	male	12.8784	4.44453
	female	11.7240	4.56504
	Total	12.2265	4.54267
RES negativity	male	31.9730	6.36631
	female	31.6823	7.56460
	Total	31.8088	7.05950
RES trust partner's devotion	male	23.0203	6.64398
	female	22.0990	7.70025
	Total	22.5000	7.26348
RES identity disclosure	male	24.6689	7.01445
	female	22.6927	8.60928
	Total	23.5529	8.00370
RES emotional attachment	male	45.2500	10.11221
	female	43.4167	11.59632
	Total	44.2147	10.99709
CISS total score	male	66.0811	11.03397
	female	65.6458	12.35299
	Total	65.8353	11.78204
IPAMMOTH	male	74.0878	7.73975
	female	74.1979	9.61850
	Total	74.1500	8.83766
IPAMFATH	male	70.3514	10.39811
	female	67.0052	11.48115
	Total	68.4618	11.13162
BORI: Alienation Subscale	male	51.3716	10.03008
	female	52.6458	8.63510
	Total	52.0912	9.27555
BORI: Insecure Attachment Subscale	male	51.1757	9.08068
	female	54.1042	9.21469
	Total	52.8294	9.25804
BORI: Egocentricity Subscale	male	52.8041	10.42607
	female	50.9583	9.37404
	Total	51.7618	9.87349
BORI: Social Incompetence Subscale	male	48.0000	10.03260
	female	50.3750	10.11789
	Total	49.3412	10.13485

Note. $n_{\text{males}}=148$, $n_{\text{females}}=192$, $n_{\text{total}}=340$

As a result of these findings, Hypothesis 6 is partially confirmed. Significant differences were found on 5 of the 12 dependent variables.

(IPPA, Armsden and Greenberg, 1987) was utilized to measure secure attachment. In this study, secure attachment was measured by the participants' perceived relationships to both mother and father, not to peer. The Relationship Experience Scale (RES; Cooke, 1996) was used to measure adult relatedness. The Continuity and Integration of Self (CISS; Wiss, 1991) was used to measure continuity and integration of self.

The Hypotheses tested were:

1. Participants who report positive levels of Liking and Respect in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self.
2. Participants who report positive levels of Trust in Partners Devotion in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self.
3. Participants who report positive levels of Intimate Disclosure in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self.
4. Participants who report positive levels of Emotional Attachment in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self.
5. Participants who report positive levels of Negativity in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self.
6. There are gender differences on the Adult Relatedness, Object Relations, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self variables.

In order to examine the relationship between the research variables: Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, Continuity and Integration of Self, and Adult Relatedness, the Pearson correlation was utilized (Chapter IV, Table 19). Stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to examine the relationship between the independent variables of Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, Continuity and Integration of Self, and components of the dependent variable, Adult Relatedness (Chapter IV, Tables 21, 22, 23, 24, & 25). Multivariate Analysis of Variance was conducted to examine gender differences on the Adult Relatedness, Object Relations, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self variables (Chapter IV, Table 26).

Overall Findings

One of the goals of this current study was to examine the relationship between Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, Continuity and Integration of Self, and Adult Relatedness. It was conjectured that these results would validate Cooke's (1996) research, which looked at the link between object relations, self, and relationship behavior. In addition, this further supports Wiss' (1991) research, which examined the connection between object relations and self. Consistent with literature it was inferred that object relations and integration of self (Cooke, 1996 and Wiss, 1991) would be correlated as well as object relations, integration of self, and relationship behavior (Cooke, 1996).

The current study further supports Wiss's (1991) study with regard to the correlations of Continuity and Integration of Self variable with Object Relations variables

(Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence). Additionally, the current study and Cooke's (1996) study found two similar results: First, to the intercorrelations of Adult Relatedness variables (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partner's Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity). Second, both studies found that Continuity and Integration of Self variable (CISS scale) showed moderate to significant relationships with Adult Relatedness variables (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partner's Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity). However, the current study found that the direction of the relationships between the Adult Relatedness variables and Object Relations variables were different than Cooke's (1996) study.

Results of this study indicated that Adult Relatedness variables are intercorrelated with each other. Three of the four measures (Object Relations, Continuity and Integration of Self and Adult Relatedness were positive and showed relationships to Adult Relatedness variables (Chapter IV, Table 19). Regarding the four Object Relations variables (Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence) and their relationship to Adult Relatedness only one Alienation had a moderate relationship with Adult Relatedness. The remaining Object Relations variables had very low relationships with Adult Relatedness. Two of which were significant Egocentricity (.12) and Social Incompetence (.17), yet they are low. They are significant because of the sample size ($N = 340$) not because of the magnitude of the relationship. Continuity and Integration of Self had a low yet significant relationship with Adult Relatedness. Attachment Security (IPPA Mother and IPPA Father) were unrelated to Adult Relatedness.

These results (i.e., intercorrelation of Adult Relatedness variables, intercorrelation of Object Relations variables, and correlation of Object Relations variables with Continuity and Integration of Self variable) validate Wiss' (1991) and Cooke's (1996) research. These findings (Chapter IV, Table 19) extend the existent body of research, which looked at the link between object relations, self, and relationship behavior (Cooke, 1996), as well as the connection between object relations functioning and self (Wiss, 1991).

Contrary to prediction, Attachment Security variables (IPPA Mother and IPPA Father) were unrelated to all measures Adult Relatedness, Object Relations, and Continuity and Integration of Self. The implications of these findings will be discussed later on this chapter under "Discussion of Research Variables."

The current study demonstrated that many of the hypotheses were not substantiated. However, certain aspects of Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 6 were substantiated to varying degrees. A discussion of each hypothesis (refer to hypotheses section, Chapter V) may help to provide insight on these findings.

Discussion of Demographics

Participants ranged in age from 17 to 20 with most participants either 18 (43.8%) or 19 years old (33.5%). Of the 340 participants 192 (56.5%) were women and 148 (43.5%) were men. The participants were represented by freshmen (51.8%) and sophomores (48.2%). Most of the participants (78.5%) were raised by both parents, and most of the parents (70.0%) were married. Most of the participants (63.5%) were White/Caucasian, and most were Catholic (64.7%). Most of the participants (90.6%) had

been in 6 or fewer romantic relationships, and most Participants (95.6%) had been in 3 or fewer serious romantic relationships. Most Participants (93.8%) indicated that they were in 4 or fewer relationships for more than 3 months. The mean for the longest relationship was 18.26 months and the mean for the longest serious relationship was 15.03 months.

Demographic characteristics of students were collected on a variety of variables ranging from personal qualities like age, gender, ethnicity, participants' marital status, religion, parents' marital status and their quality of marriage, predominant caretakers, domiciled annual income, number of siblings, birth order, and participants' relationship experiences.

Basic descriptive statistics were calculated on all the demographic variables (Chapter IV, Tables 1 to 18). Primarily, the demographic variables were for informational purposes about each participant and for future research ("Recommendations for Future Research"). To limit analyses on those demographic variables associated with this study (i.e., Hypotheses 1 to 6), gender was the variable considered. Results are discussed later on this section in "Hypotheses Discussion" (Hypothesis 6).

Discussion on Relationships of Research Variables

Pearson Correlations were conducted to assess the nature of the relationship with research variables; Adult Relatedness (Liking/respect, Negativity, Trust in Partner's Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment), Object Relations (Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social incompetence), Continuity and Integration of Self, and Attachment Security (IPPA Mother, IPPA Father). Adult Relatedness variables,

Object Relations variables, and Continuity and Integration of Self variable shared either a positive or inverse relationship.

In the present study, Adult Relatedness variables, Object Relations variables and Continuity and Integration of Self variable shared positive significant correlations. Given the sample size of this study ($N = 340$), even those correlations considered low to moderate and demonstrated significant relationships (Hatcher & Stepanski, 1994). For example, a low but real correlation of .12 ($p < .02$) was found between Liking/ Respect (RES) and Egocentricity (BORI). A moderate but real correlation of .36 ($p < .001$) was found between Negativity (RES) and Alienation (BORI).

To better understand the nature of the relationship between the research variables it is important to first address the scoring aspect of these variables. For example, a high score on Adult Relatedness variables (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partners Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity) and Attachment variables (IPPA Mother, IPPA Father) suggest a healthy/mature level of functioning. A low score would suggest the opposite, unhealthy/immature level of functioning (Cooke, 1996; Armsden and Greenberg, 1987), where as a low score on Object Relations variables (Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence) and continuity and integration of self suggest a healthy/mature level of functioning. A high score would suggest the opposite, unhealthy/immature level of functioning (Bell et al., 1987; Wiss, 1991).

The nature of the relationships with Adult Relatedness variables, Object Relations variables, and Continuity and Integration of Self variable were positive, but the direction ran counter to expectation. For example, a high correlation of .51 ($p < .001$) between Intimate Disclosure (RES) and Alienation (BORI) was found to be positive and

significant but ran counter to expectation. A high score on Intimate Disclosure (RES) suggests a *healthy* mature level of functioning, while a high score on Alienation (BORI) suggests an *unhealthy* more immature level of functioning. It would have been expected that these variables would have agreed. Yet, the direction ran counter to expectation. This finding will be discussed later in this section.

Results of Adult Relatedness Variables with Object Relations, Continuity and Integration of Self, and Attachment Security

The Adult Relatedness variables (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partner's Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity) are intercorrelated with each other and show both positive and significant relationships. This suggests that as one variable goes up the others go up, and vice versa. For example, a correlation of .63 ($p < .001$) was found between Liking and Respect and Trust in Partner's Devotion. The Adult Relatedness variables (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partner's Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity) suggest that individuals who have a strong emotional bond to their partner enjoy a more committed and satisfying relationship. He or she is more willing to engage in intimate disclosure with their partner, better able to communicate and have fewer disagreements.

The significant intercorrelation of the Adult Relatedness variables (RES subscales) demonstrated that this finding validated Cooke's (1996) study. The Relationship Experience scale (RES) was designed as a "qualitative instrument of an individual's relationship and behavioral styles in romantic experiences" (p. 70).

The Adult Relatedness variables (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partners Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity) have significant relationships with Object Relations variable (Alienation), and low to moderate relationships with (Egocentricity and Social Incompetence). The Adult Relatedness variable (Liking/Respect) was unrelated to Object Relations (Insecure Attachment). Adult Relatedness variables (Trust in Partners Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity) had low to moderate relationships with the Object Relations variable (Insecure Attachment). These findings will be explained in the following section.

The correlation of Adult Relatedness variables (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partners Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity), and Object Relations variable (Alienation) were significant, but in a direction counter to expectation. This finding suggests that individuals who experience a basic lack of trust and have difficulties with intimacy may still feel strongly about their partner and committed to their relationship.

Adult Relatedness variable (Liking/Respect) and Object Relations variable (Insecure Attachment) did not show a significant relationship. This finding suggests that one's concern about rejection in a relationship has no relation to an individual's feelings about his or her partner.

Adult Relatedness variables (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partners Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity), showed low to moderate relationships with the Object Relations variable (Insecure Attachment). These correlations suggest that individuals who tend to have some difficulty with feelings of separation, rejection, and

loneliness do not necessarily have some difficulty with relationship experiences and behavior.

Adult Relatedness variables (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partners Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity) and Object Relations variables (Egocentricity and Social Incompetence) show low to moderate relationships. These correlations suggest that individuals who tend to be somewhat shy and have greater difficulty interacting with others tend to be more manipulative and self-centered in their relationships. They tend to be less trusting of their partner's feelings, and have less satisfactory and committed relationships.

The overall intercorrelations with Adult Relatedness variables and Object Relations variables (Chapter IV, Table 19) possibly can be accounted for in part by the fact that they both evaluate different aspects of the same measure, that is relationship experiences (Cooke, 1996). The Adult Relatedness measure, (RES), suffices as a "measure of self-reported relationship experiences and behavior" (Cooke, 1996, p. 53). The object relations instrument (BORI subscales) was developed to consider "enduring patterns of interpersonal functioning in intimate relationships" (Westen, 1990a, p. 26).

Adult Relatedness variables (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partners Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity) show low to moderate relationships with Continuity and Integration of Self. These correlations suggest that individuals with a less integrated sense of self do not necessarily tend to have more difficulty communicating with their partner and more disagreements, but they are less committed to their relationships. The level of intercorrelations in the present study was quite similar to those found by Cooke (1996), which further supports Wiss' earlier (1991) study.

Contrary to expectation, Adult Relatedness variables (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partners Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity) were unrelated to Attachment Security variables (IPPA Mother, IPPA Father). This finding will be discussed later in this section under results of "Attachment Security variables (IPPA)."

Results of Object Relationship Variables with Adult Relatedness Variables, Continuity and Integration of Self, and Attachment Security

The Object Relations variables are intercorrelated with each other and show positive low, significant relationships. This suggests that as one variable goes up the others go up, and vice versa.

Object Relations variables Insecure Attachment and Social Incompetence and Egocentricity show moderate significant relationships. Individuals who long for closeness and are unable to tolerate loneliness have greater difficulty making relationships. They are more manipulative and self-centered and less concerned for their partner's feelings.

Object Relations variables Alienation and Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence show moderate significant relationships. Individuals who have greater difficulties with intimacy tend to be more sensitive to rejection, lonely, self-centered, shy, and have greater difficulty interacting with others.

Object Relations variables Egocentricity and Social Incompetence have a weak relationship. This intercorrelation suggests that one's concern for their partner's feelings has less relation to an individual's ability to interact with others, than other aspects of

object relations that may be more probable to affect how they behave within those relationships.

The results of the Object Relations variables (Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence) and Adult Relatedness variables (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partner's Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity) were previously discussed under "Results of Adult Relatedness Variables."

Object Relations variables (Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence) demonstrated significant to moderate relationships with Continuity and Integration of Self. These correlations suggests that individuals who have a more fragmented and unstable sense of self tend to have greater difficulties with intimacy, and are more fearful of abandonment or sensitive to rejection. They are more self-centered and have difficulty making friends. The level of intercorrelation found in the present study was quite similar to those shared in Cooke's (1996) and Wiss' (1991) study.

The present study's findings suffice as a successful cross-validation of both the first and second empirical study (Cooke, 1996, Wiss, 1991, respectively). These studies examined the interrelation of Object Relations Functioning (Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence), and Continuity and Integration of Self.

Results of Continuity and Integration of Self Variable with Adult Relatedness Variables, Object Relationship Variables, and Attachment Security

The results of Continuity and Integration of Self Variable with Adult Relatedness Variables and Object Relationship Variables were previously discussed under "Results of Adult Relatedness Variables," and "Results Object Relations variables." Continuity and

Integration of Self variable (CISS scale) showed moderate to significant relationships with Adult Relatedness variables (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partners Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity). Cooke (1996) found similar results. The correlations of Continuity and Integration of Self variable with Object Relations variables (Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence), further supports Wiss' (1991) study.

The current study demonstrated that the research variables, Adult Relatedness, Object Relations Functioning, and Continuity and Integration of Self, except for Secure Attachment, showed some kind of relationship (i.e., low, moderate, significant relationships). These findings further corroborate what is found in empirical literature (Bell et al., 1987; Cooke, 1996; Westen, 1991b; Wiss, 1991).

Results of Attachment Security Variables with Adult Relatedness Variables, Object Relations Variables, and Continuity and Integration of Self

Attachment Security variables (IPPA Mother, IPPA Father) were unrelated to the other research variables Adult Relatedness (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partners Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity), Object Relations (Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence), and Continuity and Integration of Self. What is curious about this study's finding is that these correlation coefficients did not show that security of parental attachment is related to adult relatedness, object relations functioning, and continuity and integration of self. Based on the theory that overall family environment is of primary importance (Bell et al., 1985), the lack of relationship in the present study suggests that one's perceived quality of

parental attachment to mother and father (IPPA Mother, IPPA Father) has no relation to an individual's internal working model (Object Relations Functioning), integration of self-representations (Continuity and Integration of Self), and behavior within a relationship (Adult Relatedness) in this sample. This lack of relatedness will be discussed further on in this chapter under "Hypotheses" and "Recommendations of Future Research."

Overall Discussion of Hypotheses

The data analysis found that some research variables (Adult Relatedness, Object Relations, Continuity and Integration of Self) have a relationship in the correlation matrix (Chapter IV, Table 19) and later did not enter in the multiple regression (Chapter IV, Tables 21 - 25). Variables may demonstrate a significant univariate relationship in the Pearson Correlation Matrix and not show a unique relationship in Multiple Regression. Pearson correlation examines the relationship of all the variables (independent and dependent) in pairs (Hatcher et al., 1994). Multiple Regression not only examines all the independent variables at once on the dependent variable(s), but assesses which variable(s) which is most related to the dependent variable(s) and explains the amount of variance accounted for (Diekhoff, 1992, 1996; Leong & Austin, 1996).

It is interesting to note that the data analysis in the Pearson Correlation (Chapter IV, Table 19) demonstrated that the research variables: Adult Relatedness, Object Relations Functioning, and Continuity and Integration of Self showed positive and low significant relationships. Yet, in multiple regression, only one Object Relations variable

(Alienation) was shown to be the most important factor in how individuals relate to others. This variable (Alienation) accounted for a significant amount of variance on Adult Relatedness variables (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partners Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity), but the direction of the relationship ran counter to expectations. These results suggest that individuals may have difficulties with intimacy and trust, but have strong feelings for their partner and committed to their relationship. This finding did not support the research of Bell and colleagues (1984). This will be discussed further on in this section as well as in "Recommendations for Future Research."

One object Relations variable (Alienation) was found to be the most significant factor in accounting for all five levels of Adult Relatedness (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partners Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, and Negativity). This finding is salient and extends the existent body of research, which suggests that within object relations, Alienation plays a central role. Cooke (1996) found Alienation to represent on each dimension of the Relationship Experience Scale (RES). Bell and colleagues (1986) similarly found Alienation to "contain high loadings on the greatest amount of items and appear to represent the broadest dimension of object relations measured" (p. 738). The present study's finding corroborated Bell and colleagues (1986) and Cooke's (1996) research. The importance of this finding will be discussed under "Recommendations for Future Research."

Object Relations variable (Alienation) was found to be the most significant factor in accounting for all five levels of Adult Relatedness (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partner's Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, and Negativity). This finding is

salient and extends to the existent body of research, which suggests that within object relations, Alienation plays a central role. Cooke (1996) found Alienation to represent on each dimension of the Relationship Experience Scale (RES). Bell and others (1986) similarly found Alienation to "contain high loadings on the greatest amount items and appears to represent the broadest dimension object relations measured," (p.738).

The present study demonstrated that many of the hypotheses were not substantiated. However, certain aspects of Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 6 were substantiated to varying degrees. It is important to note, that given the perplexity of the findings of Attachment Security variables (IPPA Mother, IPPA Father) with Adult Relatedness variables (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partners Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, and Negativity), Attachment Security variables will be discussed in greater detail at the end of Hypothesis 5 ("Discussion of Adult Relatedness variables and Attachment Security").

Hypothesis 1

It had been hypothesized that participants who report positive levels of Liking and Respect in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self.

As mentioned earlier, Alienation was found to be the most important factor in accounting for Liking and Respect in relationships, but the direction ran counter to expectations. Insecure Attachment also accounted for a significant amount of variance, and ran in the predicted direction. The data analysis (Chapter IV, Table 21) demonstrated that together, Alienation and Insecure Attachment explained 18% of the variance.

The beta coefficients indicate that college students with high scores on Liking/Respect showed greater levels of liking and respect for their partners, more alienation, and less insecure attachment. The results indicate that individuals may have strong feelings for their partner, and at the same time are less sensitive to rejection and abandonment. An individual's lack of trust and unstable relationship does not appear to have an influence on their feelings toward their partner. Thus, individuals may feel quite strongly about others while manifesting different levels of healthy/mature and unhealthy/immature object relations functioning (Cooke, 1996).

As expected, individuals who are less insecure and hypersensitive about rejection tend to be more emotionally connected to their partner. The pattern of these interrelationships (Alienation and Insecure Attachment) shows that these influences are not parallel. The incongruity between Alienation and Insecure Attachment with Liking and Respect is perplexing. One speculation is that individuals (Cooke, 1996) may exhibit immature levels of object relations in certain aspects (Alienation), while at the same time possess aspects of mature/healthy object relations (Insecure Attachment). This suggests that individuals may simultaneously manifest different levels of healthy and mature object relations functioning or unhealthy and immature object relations functioning within their relationship. Thus, the level of one's healthy or unhealthy level of object relations functioning may have a larger outcome on an individual's beliefs and behavior in a relationship, than on their overall emotional bond (Cooke, 1996).

This study's finding extends the existent body of research (Cooke, 1996) on the nature of the relationship between Adult Relatedness variable (Liking/Respect) and Object Relations variables, (Alienation and Insecure Attachment). Although Alienation

ran counter to prediction and failed to support empirical literature, the hypothesis was partially supported. College students who demonstrate positive levels of Liking and Respect tend to have healthy/mature levels of Insecure Attachment.

The Object Relations variables of Egocentricity and Social Incompetence, as well as the Attachment Security variables (IPPA Mother, IPPA Father) and Continuity and Integration of Self failed to enter, indicating that these variables did not account for unique variances in Liking and Respect.

This finding does not support empirical literature. Bell and colleagues (1986) theorized that the nature of one's object relations and internal working models of experiences directing an individual's way of relating with others and behavioral experiences would be correlated. Given the findings in the Pearson Correlation (Chapter IV, Table 19) it would have been expected that Object Relations variables (Egocentricity and Social Incompetence) and Continuity and Integration of Self would have accounted for some variance, even if counter to prediction.

Based on the research of Bell and colleagues (1985), one's overall family environment is of primary importance. The lack of variance with Attachment Security (IPPA Mother, IPPA Father) suggests that one's perceived quality of parental attachment to mother and father has no relation to an individual's behavior within a relationship (Adult Relatedness).

One explanation of this current study would suggest that these factors (Egocentricity and Social Incompetence, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self), may not have as much influence on how strongly one feels about their partner. This finding is significant, in part, that similar results are found in

Hypotheses 2 to 5. The relative youth of these college students (mean age = 18.65 years), may have been a contributing factor.

These findings shed a new perspective on current research. More empirical research in this area is needed to ascertain if college students who demonstrate positive levels of Liking and Respect will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self.

Hypothesis 2

It had been hypothesized that participants who report positive levels of Trust in Partners Devotion in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self.

Alienation was found to be the most important factor in accounting for Trust in Partners Devotion, but the direction ran counter to expectations. Continuity and Integration of Self provided additional explanatory power, but the direction ran counter to expectations. The data analysis (Chapter IV, Table 22) demonstrated that together, Alienation and Continuity and Integration of Self explained 24% of the variance.

The beta coefficients indicate that college students with high scores on Trust in Partners Devotion, showing greater levels of trust with their partners, tended to show more alienation and less integration. One way to explain the results, in this sample, is to state that the level of maturity of one's object relations and stability of self-representations has less of an influence on an individual's beliefs and behavior in a relationship. Contrary to prediction, this suggests that an individual with a level of

immature object relations functioning or less fragmented sense of self tends to trust his/her partner's feelings.

Kroger (1992) reported that identity transition is anticipated at this age (referring to young adults' ages 17 to 20) and creates bias into the group. This suggests that an individual's present level of identity cohesiveness will likely have a much more congruous influence on his or her relationship experiences, which was not found in this present study. Research has indicated that the quality of one's relationships and/or number of romantic experiences (few or numerous) has been found to correlate with immature (pathological) object relations and a poor fragmented self (Kroger, 1992a, 1992b; Orlofsky et al., 1973; Westen, 1991b). The findings in the present study, did not support empirical research. This study found that individuals may trust their partner's feelings, yet manifest immature object relations functioning and have a fragmented sense of self.

The Object Relations variables of Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity and Social Incompetence, as well as Attachment Security variables (IPPA Mother, IPPA Father) failed to enter, which indicates that these variables did not account for unique variance in Trust in Partners Devotion.

As previously mentioned in Hypothesis 1, this finding did not support empirical literature. Given the significant correlations found in the Pearson matrix (Chapter IV, Table 19) it would have been expected that Object Relations variables (Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity and Social Incompetence) would have accounted for some variance, even if counter to prediction. It was not expected that Attachment Security (IPPA Mother, IPPA Father) (Pearson Correlation, Chapter IV, Table 19) would have

been an essential element to explain the level of trust in your partner's feelings. This finding will be discussed in more detail in this section under "Findings of Adult Relatedness and Attachment Security."

Hypothesis 3

It had been hypothesized that participants who report positive levels of Intimate Disclosure in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self.

Once again, Alienation was found to be the most significant variable in accounting for levels of Intimate Disclosure, but the direction ran counter to direction. Continuity and Integration of Self entered on the second step, but the direction ran counter to expectations. Attachment Security to Mother provided additional explanatory power, but the direction ran counter to expectations. The data analysis (Chapter IV, Table 23) demonstrated that together Alienation, Continuity and Integration of Self, and Attachment Security to Mother explained 31% of the variance.

The beta coefficients indicate that college students with high scores on Intimate Disclosure, showing greater willingness to engage in intimate self disclosure, tended to show more alienation and less integration, and less secure attachment to their mothers.

The results indicate that individuals with a fragmented sense of self experience an emotionally and verbally detached relationship with their mother. They tend to have greater difficulties getting close to others, but have less difficulty sharing their feelings and thoughts with their partner. This finding, that is, the intercorrelations of Alienation,

Continuity and Integration of Self, and Attachment Security to Mother, in part, support theory.

Mahler (1968), Klein (1983), Jacobson (1964), and Winnicott (1960d) focused on early interpersonal experiences and the enduring effects that are left on the individual. An individual's past experiences, these internalized object relations, form one's perceptions and relationships with other people (St. Clair, 1996). Kohut (1971, 1977) and other self psychologists focused on how early interpersonal experiences mold the self and the structures of the self. Bowlby (1977) theorized that there is a strong relationship between one's experiences with his or her parents and their later capacity to make affectional bonds.

Considering only the intercorrelations of Alienation, Continuity and Integration of Self, and Attachment Security to Mother, these factors supported aspects of object relations, attachment, and self. It is important to be reminded that the direction of these factors, (Alienation, Continuity and Integration of Self, Attachment Security to Mother), ran counter to expectations. Thus, suggesting that these factors with regard to their relationship with Intimate Disclosure did not support theory.

The object relations variables of Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity and Social Incompetence, as well as the father attachment variable failed to enter, which indicates that these variables did not account for unique variance in Intimate Disclosure.

This finding did not support empirical literature. Given the significant correlations found in the Pearson matrix (Chapter IV, Table 19) it would have been expected that Object Relations variables (Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence) would have accounted for some variance, even if counter to prediction.

The lack of unique variance in Intimate Disclosure will be discussed in more detail later in this section under "Summary of Findings: Hypotheses 1.0 to 5.0." It was not expected that Attachment Security (IPPA Mother, IPPA Father) (Chapter IV, Table 19) would have accounted for any level of one's feelings and thoughts to his/her partner. However, Attachment Security to mother did account for some amount of variance.

If the reader were not to consider the findings in the Pearson matrix (Chapter IV, Table 19), then it would have been thought that Attachment Security to father, rather than to mother, would have explained some variance with Intimate Disclosure. Armsden (1986) examined attachment in late adolescence and found the significance of a father's influence in late adolescent development. Silver (1995) found that Attachment Security to mother was only consequential in predicting attachment adjustment to college students.

Hypothesis 4

It had been predicted that participants who report positive levels of Emotional Attachment in their relationships will have healthy Object Relations Functioning, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self.

Interestingly, Alienation was found to be the only factor in an accounting for levels of Emotional Attachment, but the direction ran counter to expectations. The data analysis (refer to Chapter IV, Table 22) demonstrated that Alienation explained 16% of the variance.

The beta coefficients indicate that college students with high scores on Emotional Attachment showing greater levels of commitment and devotion to the relationship, tended to show more alienation. These results suggest that individuals who have

problems with intimacy do not tend to have difficulty committing to a relationship. It appears that one's level of object relations functioning; in this case unhealthy/immature level of functioning did not have a negative effect on his/her relationship. One would hypothesize that individuals who tend to have superficial, unstable relationships would also report having problems being committed to their partner. Equally, individuals who tend to be devoted and committed to their partner would have stable and gratifying relationships. Contrary to prediction, unhealthy/immature levels of Alienation explained 16% of variance on Emotional Attachment.

This finding did not support the theorized correlation between internal working models of relationships and romantic relationship experiences (Fishler et al., 1990). College students with a basic lack of trust and difficulties with intimacy in their relationship did not tend to have problems committing to their partners.

The object relations variables of insecure attachment, egocentricity and social incompetence, as well as the mother/father attachment variables and the continuity and integration of self variable failed to enter, which indicates that these variables did not account for unique variance in Emotional Attachment. Similar findings were demonstrated earlier. As previously speculated, these factors (Insecure Attachment, Social Incompetence, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self) may not have as much influence on how strongly one feels about his/her partner. This will be discussed in more detail later on in this section under "Summary of Findings: Hypotheses 1 to 5."

Hypothesis 5

It had been predicted that participants who report high levels of Negativity in their relationships will have healthy object relations functioning, mother and father attachment, and continuity and integration of self.

Alienation was found to be the most significant factor in accounting for levels of Negativity, but the direction ran counter to expectations. Egocentricity provided additional explanatory power for levels of Negativity, but ran counter to expectations. The data analysis (refer to Chapter IV, Table 22) demonstrated that together, Alienation and Egocentricity explained 15% of the variance.

The beta coefficients indicate that college students with high scores on Negativity showing less frequent disagreements and negative communication styles, tended to show more alienation and egocentricity. This suggests that individuals who are more self-centered tend to manipulate others for personal gain. They have difficulties getting close, lack trust in their relationships, but tend to have fewer disagreements with their partner.

Bell and colleagues (1984) and Fishler and colleagues (1990) hypothesized that an individual's level of object relations or internal working models of relationships would significantly influence one's intimate relationships. Contrary to prediction unhealthy/immature levels of Alienation and Egocentricity explained 15% of a variance on Emotional Attachment. This suggests that individuals, who tend to mistrust their partner's motivation or lack concern for his or her feelings, may tend to have problems with intimacy but still be devoted to their partner.

The object relations variables of insecure attachment and social incompetence, as well as the mother/father attachment variables and the continuity and integration of self

variable failed to enter, which indicates that these variables did not account for unique variance in Negativity. One explanation of this current study, would suggest that these factors (Insecure Attachment, Social Incompetence, Attachment Security, both mother and father, and Continuity and Integration of Self) may not have as much influence on one's level of commitment to his/her partner. Given these findings are salient throughout the hypotheses, more will be discussed later on in this section under "Summary of Findings: Hypotheses 1 to 5."

Findings of Hypotheses 1 to 5

Considering the lack of relationship between Attachment Security (IPPA Mother, IPPA Father) and the research variables (Adult Relatedness, Object Relations Functioning, Continuity and Integration of Self) and lack of variance accounted for on Adult Relatedness variables, it is important to dedicate an entire section to this finding.

It had been hypothesized that college students who demonstrate positive levels of Adult Relatedness (Liking and Respect, Trust in Partners Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity) will have healthy Attachment Security (IPPA Mother, IPPA Father). Ainsworth and others (1978) found that development of a functioning relationship between an infant and his or her primary caretaker is a mother's sensitivity, passion, and responsiveness during their interactions. According to Hazan and Shaver (1987), it is from this experience that children form "inner working models of themselves and their major social-interaction with partners" (p. 512). The ensuing expectations contained in these mental models affect these behavioral styles. It is anticipated, that

given a sound family environment, there will be continuity in relationship patterns based on these internal models of self and social life (Cooke, 1996).

As previously mentioned, Bell and colleagues (1985), theorized that one's overall family environment is of primary importance. Armsden (1986) examined attachment in late adolescence and found the significance of a father's influence in late adolescence development. Adolescents who stated a secure attachment to both parents or just to father showed higher levels of well being than individuals with either an insecure attachment to both parents or a secure attachment to only mother. According to Ainsworth and Wittig (1969), the adeptness of the child to use the mother as a secure base for exploration was one of the most significant factors for a healthy attachment.

Interestingly, this present study did not support these findings. The lack of correlation of Attachment Security (IPPA Mother, IPPA Father) with the research variables (Chapter IV, Table 19), as well as the lack of variance to the Adult Relatedness variables (Chapter IV, Tables 21 to 25) may suggest that one's perceived quality of parental attachment to mother and father has no relation to an individual's behavior within a relationship (Adult Relatedness).

As discussed in Chapter II, the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA) is the Attachment Security scale administered in this study. This instrument (IPPA) was developed on predominantly middle class undergraduate students ($N = 179$) ranging in age from 16 to 20. The validity of the IPPA was demonstrated in a separate study of students ($N = 86$) ranging in age from 17 to 20 (Armsden & Greenberg 1987). Similar to Armsden and Greenberg's (1987) research, students' age in this current study ranged

from 17 to 20. Therefore, age did not appear to account for the lack of correlation in this study.

There are several possible reasons why the students' "perceptions of the positive and negative affective/cognitive measure of relationships with their parents" (Armsden and Greenberg 1987, p.1, A9) were unrelated to the research variables (Adult Relatedness, Object Relations, Continuity and Integration of Self) as well as not supporting the hypotheses. The IPPA (Armsden & Greenberg 1987) measures the degree of mutual trust, quality of communication, and extent of anger and alienation. The IPPA which assess an adolescents' attachment to mother, father, and peers has high intercorrelations between and within the parent and peer measure. Thus, suggesting the subscales are not distinct and may be assessing the same construct. Research suggests combining the mother and father subscales (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; May, 1990; Silver, 1995). Assessing the Attachment Security Scale (IPPAmother, IPPAfather) separately rather than collectively may have contributed to the lack of relationships between the research variables and lack of support of the hypotheses. Kenny (1990) has suggested to use the Parental Attachment Questionnaire (PAQ) which uses single rating for both parents. The PAQ is a well used instrument administered by researchers to assess attachment.

The IPPA (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987) is designed to assess "adolescents' perceptions of the positive and negative affective/cognitive measure of relationships" (p.1, A9). This instrument has "shown substantial reliability and good potential validity as a measure of perceived quality of close relationship in late adolescence" (p. 446). This study assessed both the IPPA Parent Attachment and IPPA Peer Attachment scales. This

current study did not assess the IPPA Peer Attachment subscale. Eliminating the IPPA Peer scale may have contributed to the lack of relationship between Attachment Security variables and (IPPA Mother) the other research variables (Adult Relatedness, Object Relations, Continuity and Integration of Self), and lack of support of the hypotheses. Armsden and Greenberg (1987) respond that

Relatively low correlation between self-reported quality of relationships to parents than to peers. Thus, there does not seem to be a plaintive set of individuals reporting homogeneously across two different types of attachment figures. As hypothesized in this study, differential associations were found between outcome measures of security of attachment to peers vs parents (p. 447).

The IPPA Attachment Scale assesses the student's perceived quality of attachment with each parent. The participants may have had difficulty interpreting statements dealing with 'perceived quality of parental relationship'. The students' interpretation could have tainted the validity of their responses. The inherent way individuals interpret items may have compromised the reliability of this instrument (IPPA Mother, IPPA Father) in the current study.

There have been several studies that utilized the IPPA Attachment scale to assess security of parental attachment in college aged students. Silver (1995) found that parental attachment, as measured by the IPPA Parent Attachment Scale, was significantly related to adjustment of college students (ages 18 -19). Armsden and Greenberg (1987) tested students ranging in age from 17 to 20 and demonstrated that

quality of parent and peer attachments in late adolescence was highly related to well-being, particularly to self-esteem, and life satisfaction . . . quality of attachment to parents was significantly related to the criterion measures after quality of peer attachment and life change had been controlled (pp. 445 - 446).

Armsden and Greenberg's (1987) findings further corroborated the research of Mortimer and Lawrence (1980).

Mortimer and Lawrence (1980) found significant influences of family relationships on self-esteem in college students. Even though the IPPA Attachment Scale taps facets of the present day experiences with one's parents, empirical literature has shown that parent-child experiences are quite consistently reliable throughout development (Crandall, 1972; Hunt & Eichorn, 1972). Block and Block's (1984) research further suggest that there is continuity in one's philosophy of child-rearing. These studies substantiate Bowlby's (1969, 1982) theory that short of major interruptions in experience, quality of attachment is long-lasting. Thus, another way to interpret the findings in the present study is to consider the quality of perceived attachment the college student has with his/her parents. If one's perception of his/her attachment to the parent is negative, their perceived quality of attachment would be lacking. Such conclusion would be congruent with Bowlby's theory.

An alternative explanation is to consider that this current study is the first to examine security of parental attachment, level of object relations functioning, romantic relationship behaviors, and identity integration of college students (ages 17 - 20). Simply, the results of this study may demonstrate that security of parental attachment is

not related to college students' level of object relations functioning, adult relatedness, and identity integration.

Finally, the IPPA Attachment Scale is a self-report instrument. The other research variables (Adult Relatedness, Object Relations, Continuity and Integration of Self) utilize self-report measures, but their focus does not pertain to one's perceived quality of relationship. The IPPA Attachment Scale

has shown substantial reliability and good potential validity as a measure of perceived quality of close relationships in late adolescence. . . .Construct validity remains to be demonstrated through clinical assessment of adolescents' psychological functioning (rather than self-report methods). One question that might be raised regards validity of findings resulting solely from self-report measures. While multimethod investigations will provide necessary corroboration of these findings, the pattern of results provides evidence to support their validity. . . .Behavioral observations of adolescents' interactions with their parents and peers are needed to further validate the IPPA (Armsden and Greenberg, 1987, p. 447).

Self-report measures (Borg & Gall, 1989) explain one of the limitations of this current study. This point will be discussed further on in this chapter under "Recommendations of Future Research."

Certainly more empirical research in this area is needed to ascertain if parental and/or peer attachment security is related to the degree or level of maturity of one's object relations functioning, level of identity integration, and aspects of adult relatedness.

Summary of Findings: Hypotheses 1 to 5

It was expected that Object Relations variables (Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence) would be significantly correlated with Adult Relatedness variables (Liking/ Respect, Trust in Partners Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity), and support the hypotheses. Rather, the direction of the Object Relations variables (Alienation, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence) ran counter to expectations. According to the object relations model, one of the elements of immature or disrupted personality growth is unstable interpersonal experiences. Similar disturbances in relationships have been researched and empirically established in literature on adult romantic attachment (Bierhoff, 1991; Collins & Read, 1990; Hazan & Shaver 1987; Shaver & Clark, 1994) in people with insecure (avoidant or anxious/ambivalent) attachment.

In this study, Object Relations variables (Alienation, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence) demonstrated unhealthy/immature levels of functioning. One way to explain this result is that, in this sample, the level of maturity of one's object relations and stability of self representations does not appear to have as much influence on an individual's beliefs and behavior in a relationship. Therefore, an individual with an immature object relations or less fragmented sense of self may tend to have a strong emotional bond to their partner. They may have less difficulty with the level of trust in their partner's feelings, and less difficulties maintaining an intimate and stable relationship.

In light of these results, some significance was found even if contrary to the predicted direction (refer to Hypotheses 1 to 5). Alternatively, this study may have

demonstrated that college students are more self involved and have less difficult time distinguishing themselves from others. Although, while in the relationship they are committed and have a strong emotional bond to their partner, they tend to have problems with intimacy. College students may have more superficial and ungratifying relationships, but engage in fewer styles of negative communication. A significant aspect of this study would entertain how college students manifest different levels of functioning (object relations, attachment, or self) and demonstrate positive/ healthy aspects of relationship behavior to their partner.

Bell and colleagues (1986) found that Alienation "contains high loadings on the greatest number of items and appears to represent the broadest dimension of object relations measured" (p. 738). According to the researchers (1986) if any of the other subscales Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence show elevation Alienation will consistently show high loadings. The current study supported Bell and others (1986) hypothesis. Both Insecure Attachment and Egocentricity showed elevation. Alienation showed high loadings and was shown to be the most important factor in how individuals relate to others.

In conclusion, certain aspects of Object Relations functioning (Alienation and Egocentricity), Continuity and Integration of Self and Attachment Security (IPPA Mother) explained essential elements of variance with Adult Relatedness variables (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partner's Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity). However, the direction ran counter to expectations. Object Relations (Insecure Attachment) ran in the predicted direction, with Liking and Respect. For the most part, the findings of this study did not support the hypotheses.

Hypothesis 6

It had been predicted that there are gender differences on the Adult Relatedness, Object Relations, Attachment Security, and Continuity and Integration of Self variables. Hypothesis 6.0 is partially confirmed. Significant differences were found on five (Liking/Respect, Intimate Disclosure, Father Attachment, Object Relations Insecure Attachment, Object relations Social Incompetence), of the twelve variables.

Gender Differences

Overall these results suggest that men demonstrated higher or more mature levels of functioning than did women. Interestingly, in the areas where the mean for the women was significantly higher than the mean for the men, results showed women manifested more unhealthy or immature levels of functioning than the men.

Liking/Respect

The mean of 12.87 for the males was significantly higher than the mean of 11.72 for the females. This suggests that men tend to have a stronger emotional bond to their partner, than do women. Traditional wisdom holds that women are much more emotionally connected to others, than men. Yet, these findings suggest the opposite, that men have more respect for their partner and care more deeply, than do women.

Intimate Disclosure

The mean of 24.66 for the males was significantly higher than the mean of 22.69 for the females. This finding indicates that men tend to be more willing to share their thoughts and feelings with their partner, unlike women, who are less willing to engage in intimate disclosure. A possible explanation is that for women sharing one's deepest

feelings would open them up to the risk of rejection. For men, the willingness to share may be incongruent to rejection.

Attachment Security to Father

The mean of 70.35 for the males was significantly higher than the mean of 67 for the females. According to Bowlby (1988), a strong attachment to father may be significant in providing a secure base. Armsden (1986) found the significance of a father's influence in late adolescent development. The findings of this study, suggest that men tend to be more well adjusted and have higher self esteem than women. They feel more securely attached to their father and enjoy a higher quality of relationship with their peers, than do women.

Snoek and Rothblum (1979) found that in college students, there was an association between greater self-disclosure tendencies and warm and autonomous relations with their parents. The findings of the current study give support to empirical literature. The mean for men was significantly higher in both Intimate Disclosure and Attachment Security to Father.

Object Relations Insecure Attachment

The mean of 54.10 for the females was significantly higher than the mean of 51.17 for the males. Women tend to be more worried about being rejected and abandoned than do men. For women, longings for closeness are more present. They have more difficulty handling separations and loneliness. This finding would tend to substantiate the findings of Intimate Disclosure. It was conjectured, that in order for women to protect themselves from possible rejection, they would tend to be less willing to share their most intimate thoughts and feelings to their partner. Men would tend to

feel less anxious or concerned about being rejected, thus, more willing to engage in intimate disclosure.

Object Relations Social Incompetence

The mean of 50.37 for the females was significantly higher than the mean of 48.00 for the males. This suggests that women have greater difficulty initiating or entering into social relationships. They tend to be shy, nervous, and somewhat uncertain about how to interact with the opposite sex. Whereas, men are better able to tolerate separations, losses, and loneliness. Once again, this finding further supports and substantiates the other findings of Hypothesis 6.

Given these findings, it is suggested that more research be conducted in this area. First, to better understand the gender differences already found. Second, to examine the lack of significant differences between the other dependent variables (refer to "Recommendations for Future Research").

Summary: Importance of this Study

The current study was the first to examine the relationship of Adult Relatedness, Object Relations, Continuity and Integration of Self (CISS scale), and Secure Attachment (IPPA Mother, IPPA Father). This study's findings on Object Relations functioning (e.g., Alienation) and Continuity and Integration of Self suffice as a successful cross-validation of both Cooke (1996) and Wiss' (1991) research, which examined the interrelation of object relations functioning and continuity and integration of self. Furthermore, the results of the present study serve to cross-validate Cooke's research which additionally examined the interrelation of one's relationship behavior. Wiss first developed the CISS

scale and demonstrated significant correlations with all four BORI subscales, as did Cooke, who first developed the RES scale.

The findings of this present study demonstrated that an individual's way of relating with others, the degree or level of maturity of one's object relations functioning, and level of identity integration (Bell et al., 1987) showed significant zero-order correlations which cross-validated Cooke's (1996) and Wiss' (1991) study but the direction of the relationships were different. These findings were less supported in the multivariate analyses.

Limitations of the Study

A sample of convenience was utilized which consisted of undergraduate college students enrolled in psychology class. Since the participants were not randomly selected, results of this study cannot be generalized to other populations. In order to further generalize results, other populations will need to be explored. This study utilized self-report instruments (paper and pencil) and was subject to the inherent limitations in these measures (e.g., participants' perceptions and willingness to self-disclose, etc.). Research utilizing other measures will need to be conducted (e.g., behavioral observations of adolescents' interactions with their parents and peers, etc.).

The construct validity of the BORI (Bell et al., 1984, 1985, 1987) scale is questioned. There are several problems with the scale:

One problem is that Bellak et al (1984, 1985, 1987) offered no decision rule regarding how a global rating of object relations should be made from the results of rating four dimensions, yet only global ratings are used in reports of

this research. No interrater agreement for the various dimensions is offered, nor are correlations of the four dimensions presented. Moreover, no correlations between object relations dimensions and validating criteria are offered. It appears that the authors did not view their dimensions as discrete aspects of object relations, but rather as an organizing structure for making a global evaluation of a person's level of object relations (Bell et al., 1995, p. 48.).

Another problem with this scale (BORI) lie in the factor analysis of the four factors (Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence). Each item of the four factors has a weight on each scale, which means they all can contribute to each subscale. In other words every item of the factor scores loads on every scale but with different factorial weights. The scale (BORI) does not produce which items of the 45-item true/false statements load on which subscales Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence (Weinberg, WPS, 2002). This limitation causes one to question the extent to which the measure reflects its construct of interest.

Two external events may have affected the participants' sense of alienation (basic trust). First, data was collected within weeks after the tragedy of September 11, 2001. Second, Seton Hall University sophomores who participated in the study were freshmen when the university was tragically affected by a dormitory fire which claimed three lives and injured many others. Lack of trust was the main factor that impeded the students from leaving the dormitory. The students questioned the authenticity of the fire alarms. Trust or lack of played a major factor in both of these tragic events.

In closing, the current study was correlational, therefore, care must be taken not to exercise causal interpretations to the data.

Recommendations for Future Research

This was the first study to examine the relationships of Adult Relatedness (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partners Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity), Object Relations functioning (Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence), Attachment Security (IPPA Mother and IPPA Father), and Continuity and Integration of Self. A significant finding from this study concerned the Object Relations variable (Alienation) that was found to be the most significant factor in accounting for all five levels of Adult Relatedness (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partners Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, and Negativity). As stated previously, this finding is salient and extends the existent body of research, which suggests that within object relations, Alienation plays a central role. Cooke (1996) found Alienation to be represented on each dimension of the Relationship Experience Scale (RES). Future studies should further explore this similarity between the relationship of Alienation to Adult Relatedness (Liking/Respect, Trust in Partners Devotion, Intimate Disclosure, Emotional Attachment, Negativity).

Projective measures are considered to be able to examine the depth and complexity of object relations more than objective techniques (Fishler et al., 1990). According to Strickler et al (1990) projective techniques such as Rorschach responses, drawings, dream reports, and Thematic Apperception (TAT: Murray, 1938) are planned to draw out object representations. Projective measures may be a more accurate measure

of object relations. Future research could include the use of projective measures rather than measuring objective techniques.

Other research should focus on the influence of various background experiences that may covary with the demographic variables examined, such as age, gender, ethnic background, and religion. Especially, studies should examine the effects of the participants' relationship experiences (i.e., romantic history experiences) with the research variables.

Even though the size of this study's sample appeared more than adequate to support the analyses conducted, and there was a normative distribution the predominance of White/Caucasian participants in this study prevented my ability to examine the way in which other life experiences (e.g., ethnic background) may have influenced one's integration of self and relationship styles.

The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment -Revised (IPPA, Armsden & Greenberg, 1987) scale is the only instrument, to date, which demonstrates separate examinations, for the quality of mother and father attachments, in adolescence. Empirical literature has been somewhat silent on the diverse influences of mother and father attachment. Given the fact that Attachment Security did not show significance in this study, more research is needed. Future research could explore the relative importance of relationships with parents and peers in relation to the college students' level of object relations functioning, continuity of integration of self, and adult relatedness.

Another area in which research could be explored would be to more directly make an association between present theory on identity development and its implications for

general personality organization and involvement in romantic relationships. This study used an instrument of the underlying construct of continuity and integration of self, as did Cooke (1996), instead of allocating students to classes based on their status of identity development (e.g., achievement, moratorium, foreclosure, and diffusion). Future research may want to consider, evaluating Participants' identity statuses.

Considering the significant correlations found in the Pearson matrix (refer to Chapter IV, Table 19) it would have been expected that Object Relations variables (Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, Social Incompetence) would have accounted for more variances, as regarding the Adult Relatedness variables. Future research may want to explore these differences. In addition, other studies should investigate how participants manifest different levels of functioning (object relations, attachment, or self) and demonstrate positive/ healthy aspects of relationship behavior to their partner.

Lastly, this is the second study to utilize the Relationship Experience Scale. Cooke (1996) found the instrument to have excellent internal consistency and split-half reliability. This measure presents as a valid and reliable criterion measure of relationship experiences. Since validation of this instrument is at its early stages, the next action would be to cross-validate the Relationship Experience Scale. An essential element of the cross-validation would be to expand on the current study with another community sample, favorably one with a more normative distribution of age, gender, marital status, and ethnic background.

References

- Ainsworth, M. Blehar, M., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Ainsworth, M., & Bowlby, J. (1991). An ethological approach to personality development. *American Psychologist*, 46, 331-341.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S. & Wittig, B. A. (1969). Attachment and exploratory behavior of one-year-olds in a strange situation. In B. Foss (Ed.). *Determinants of infant behavior*, Vol. 4. New York: Erlbaum.
- Alpher, V. S. (1996). Identity and introject in dissociative disorders. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 64, 1238-1244.
- Allport, G. (1955). *Becoming : Basic consideration for a psychology of personality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Armsden, G. G. (1986). Attachment to parents and peers in late adolescence: Relationships to affective status, self-esteem and coping with loss, threat and challenge. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, 1986). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 42, 6193.
- Armsden, G. C., & Greenberg, M. T. (1987). The inventory of parent and peer attachment: Individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 16 (5), 427-453.
- Becker, B., Bell, M., & Billington, R. (1987). Object relations ego deficits in bulimic college women. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 43, 92-95.
- Bell, M. (1995). *An introduction to the Bell Object Relations and Reality Testing Inventory*. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.
- Bell, N. J., Avery, A. W., Jenkins, D., Feid, J., & Schoenrock, C. J. (1985). Family relationships and social competence during late adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 14, 109-119.
- Bell, M. D., Billington, R. J., & Becker, B. (1985). Scale for the assessment of reality testing: Reliability, validity, and factorial invariance. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 53 (4), 506-511.
- Bell, M., Billington, R., & Becker, B. (1986). A scale for the assessment of object relations: Reality, validity, and factorial invariance. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 44 (5), 733-741.

- Bell, M. D., Billington, R. J., Cicchetti, D., & Gibbons, J. (1988). Do object relations deficits distinguish BPD from other diagnostic groups. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 44*, 511-516.
- Bellak, S., Hurvich, M., & Gediman, H. (1973). *Ego functions in schizophrenics, neurotics, and normals*. New York: John Wiley
- Bierhoff, H. W. (1991). Twenty years of research on love: Theory, results, and prospects for the future. *The German Journal of Psychology, 15* (2), 95-117.
- Blatt, S. J. & Blass, R. B. (1992). Relatedness and self-definition: Two primary dimensions In personality development, psychopathology, and psychotherapy. In J. W. Barron, M. N. eagle & D. L. Wolitzky (Eds.), *Interface of psychoanalysis and psychology* (pp. 399-428). Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.
- Blatt, S. J., Brenneis, C. B., Schimek, J.G., & Glick, M. (1976a) *A developmental analysis of the concept of the object on the Rorschach*. Unpublished scoring protocol.
- Blatt, S. J., Brenneis, C. B., Schimek, J.G., & Glick, M. (1976b) Normal development and psychopathological impairment of the concept of the object on the Rorschach. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 85*, 364-373.
- Blatt, S. J., & Lerner, H. (1983). The psychological assessment of object representation. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 47* (1), 7-27
- Blatt, S. J., & Ritzer, B. (1974). Thought disorder and boundary disturbance in psychosis. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 4*, 370-381.
- Block, J. (1971). *Lives through time*. Berkeley, CA: Bancroft.
- Blustein, D., Walbridge, M.M., Friedlander, M. L., & Palladino, D. E. (1991). Contributions of psychological separation and parental attachment to the career development process. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, (1), 39-50.
- Bond, M., Gardner, S.T., Christian, J., & Sigal, J. J. (1983). Empirical study of self-rated defense styles. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 40*, 333-338.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). *Educational research: An introduction* (5th ed.). New York: Longman
- Bowlby, J. (1958). The nature of the child's tie to his mother. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 39* 350-373.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1: Attachment*. New York: Basic.

- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 2: Separation-Anxiety and Anger*. New York: Basic.
- Bowlby, J. (1977). The making and breaking of affectional bonds: Aetiology and psychopathology in the light of attachment theory. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 130, 201-210.
- Bowlby, J. (1978). Attachment theory and its therapeutic implications. *Adolescent Psychiatry*, 6, 5-33.
- Bowlby, J. (1979). Psychoanalysis as art and science. *International Review of Psychoanalysis*, 6, 3-14.
- Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 3 loss, sadness and depression*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1982). Attachment and loss: Retrospect and prospect. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 52, (4), 664-678.
- Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Parent-child attachment and healthy human Development*, 137-157. New York: Basic Books
- Bradford, E., & Lyddon, W. (1993). Current parental attachment: Its relation to perceived psychological distress and relationship satisfaction in college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 34, 256-260.
- Bretherton, I. (1985). Attachment theory: Retrospect and prospect. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 50, 3-35.
- Buckley, P. (1986). (Ed.). *Essential papers on object relations*. New York: New York University Press
- Burns, B. & Viglione, D. J. (1996). The Rorschach human experience variable, interpersonal relatedness, and object representation in nonpatients. *Psychological Assessment*, 8 (1), 92-99.
- Burke, W. F., Summers, F., Selinger, D., & Polonus, T. W. (1986). The comprehensive object relations profile: A preliminary report. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 3, 173-185.
- Campbell, E., Adams, G. R., & Dobson, W. R. (1984). Familial correlates of identity formation in late adolescence: A study of the predictive utility of connectedness and individuality in family relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 267-283.
- Cohen, J. (1992). *A power primer Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 112, (1), 155-159.

- Cohler, B. J., & Stoot, F. M. (1987). Separation, interdependence, and social relations across the second half of life. In J. Bloom-Feshbach & S. Bloom-Feshbach (Eds.), *The Psychology of separation and loss* (pp. 165-191). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cooke, A. (1996). Object relations and self representations: Implications for adult relatedness and mental health. Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1-93.
- Coonerty, S. (1986). An exploration of separation-individuation themes in borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 50, 501-511.
- Collins, N. L. & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social psychology*, 58 (4), 644-663.
- Crain, W. (1992). *Theories of development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Diekhoff, G. (1992). *Statistics for the social and behavioral sciences: Univariate, bivariate, multivariate*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Eagle, M. (1993) *Recent developments in psychoanalysis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Edwards, W.L.(1993). *Description and prediction of parental grief due to the death of a child*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Garrett-Evangelical theological Seminary, Evanston, IL.
- Epstein, S. (1973). The self concept revisited or a theory of a theory. *American Psychologist*, 29, 309-336.
- Epstein, S. (1980). The self-concept: A review and the proposal of an integrated theory of personality. In E. Staub (Ed.), *Personality: Basic Issues and Current Research*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Epstein, S. (1981). The unity principle versus the reality and pleasure principles, or the tale of the scorpion and the frog. In M. D. Lynch, A. A. Norem-Hebeisen, & K. Gergen (Eds.), *Psychological Perspectives on the Self, Vol. 1*, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Epstein, S. (1983). The unconscious, the preconscious, and the self-concept. In J. Suls and A. G. Greenwald (Eds.), *Psychological Perspectives on the Self, Vol. 1*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and society* (2nd ed.). New York: Norton.

- Erikson, E. H. (1980). *Identity and the life cycle*. New York: Norton.
- Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity, youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Fairbairn, W. R. D. (1954). The repression and the return of bad objects. In *An object relations theory of personality* (pp. 59-81). New York: Basic Books. (Original work published 1943).
- Fairbairn, W. R. D. (1954b). Object-relationships and dynamic structure. In *An object relations theory of the personality* (pp. 137-161). New York: Basic Books. (Original work published 1946).
- Feeney, J. A., & Noller, P. (1990). Attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 281-291.
- Fraiberg, S. (1969). Libidinal Object Constancy and Mental Representation. *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, Vol. 14, New York: International Universities Press, 9-47.
- Freud, S. (1911). Formulation on the two principles of mental functioning. In *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud*, (ed.), J. Strachey, Vol. 14, London: Hogarth, 1957.
- Freud, S. (1914). On narcissism: An introduction. In *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud*, (ed.), J. Strachey, Vol. 14, London: Hogarth, 1957.
- Freud, S. (1945). Indications for child analysis. *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, Vol. 1, 127-149, New York: International Universities Press.
- Freud, S. (1962). *Three essays on the theory of sexuality*. New York: Basic Books. (Original work published 1905).
- Fishler, P. H., Sperling, M. B., & Carr, A. C. (1990). Assessment of adult relatedness: A review of empirical findings from object relations and attachment theories. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 55, 499-520.
- Gerson, M. (1984). Splitting: The development of a measure. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 40, 157-162.
- Gibbons, J. (1984). *Prediction of object representations from projective test data: Borderline Personality? Disorder (DSM III)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University.
- Glesser, G. C., & Ihilevich, D. (1969). An objective instrument for measuring defense mechanisms. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical psychology*, 33, 51-60.

- Gomez, L. (1997). *An introduction to object relations*. New York: New York University Press.
- Greenberg, J. (1982). *Reliability and validity of the inventory of adolescent attachments*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Washington, Seattle.
- Greenberg, L. S. & Mitchell, S. A. (1983). *Object relations in psychoanalytical theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Greenberg, M. T., Siegel, J. M. & Leitch, C. J. (1983). The nature and importance of attachment relationships to parents and peers during adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 12, (5), 373-386.
- Grey, A., & Davies, M. (1981). Mental health as level of interpersonal maturity. *Journal of Psychiatry*, 146 (12), 1552-1560.
- Hamburg, D. A., & Adams, J. E. (1967). A perspective on coping behavior: Seeking and utilizing information in major transitions. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 17, 277-284.
- Hamilton, N. G., (1989). A critical review of object relations theory. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 146, (12), 1552-1560.
- Harder, D. W., Greenwald, D. F., Wechsler, S., & Ritzler, B. A. (1984). The Urist Mutuality of Autonomy Scale as an indicator of psychopathology. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 40, 1078-1083.
- Hartman, H. (1950). Comments on the psychoanalytic theory of the ego. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 5, 74-96.
- Harvey, M., & Byrd, M. (2000). Relationships between adolescents' attachment styles and family functioning. *Adolescence*, 35, 345-355.
- Hatcher, L. & Edward, J. S., (2001). *A step-North Carolina: SAS institute Inc. by-step approach to using the SAS system for univariate and multivariate statistics*. North Carolina: SAS Publishing
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52 (3), 511-524.
- Hinde, R. (1979). Attachment: Some conceptual and biological issues. In J. Stevenson Hinde, and C. MurrayParkes (Eds.), *The place of attachment in human behavior*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hinde, R., & Stevenson-Hinde, J. (1986). Ethological and relationships approaches. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Annals of child development*, Vol. 6. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press

- Hindy, C., & Schwartz, J. (1984). *Individual differences in the tendency toward anxious romantic attachments*. Paper presented to the Second International Conference on Personal Relationships, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI.
- Hurtup, W., & Rubin, A. (1986). Peer relations. In Paul H. Mussen, *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, personality and social development*. New York: Wiley
- Jacobson, E. (1964). *The self and the object world*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Kaplan G. C., & Main, M. (1985). *The attachment inventory for Adults*. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Berkeley.
- Karen, R. (1998). *Becoming attached: First relationships and how they shape our capacity to love*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kenny, M. E. (1987). The extent and function of parental attachment among first-year college students. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 16, 17-29.
- Kenny, M. E. (1990). Contributions of parental attachment and family structure to the social and psychological functioning of first-year college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 38, (4), 479-486.
- Kenny, M. E., & Donaldson, G. A. (1992). The relationship of parental attachment and psychological separation to the adjustment of the first-year college women. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33, 431-438.
- Kernberg, O. (1975). *Borderline conditions and pathological narcissism*. New York: Jason Aronson.
- Kernberg, O. (1976). *Object relations theory and clinical psychoanalysis*. New York: Aronson.
- Kernberg, O. (1984). *Object relations theory and clinical practice*. New York: Jason Aronson.
- Klein, M. (1973). *Introduction to the work of Melaine Klein*. London: W. Heinmann.
- Klein, M. (1975a). The early development of conscience in the child. In *Love, guilt and reparation and other works, 1921-1945*, (pp. 248-257). New York: Delta Books. (Original work published 1933).
- Klein, M. (1975b). Our adult world and its roots in infancy. In *Envy and gratitude and other works, 1946-1963*, (pp. 247-263). New York: Delta Books. (Original work published 1959).

- Kohut, H. (1966). Forms and transformations of narcissism. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 14, 243-272.
- Kohut, H. (1971). *The analysis of the self: A systematic approach to the treatment of the narcissistic personality disorders*. Madison, CT: International Universities Press.
- Kohut, H. (1977). *The analysis of the self*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Kohut, H. H., & Wolf, E. (1978). The disorders of the self and their treatment: An outline. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 59, 413-425.
- Kohut, H. (1980b). From a letter to one of the participants at the Chicago conference on the psychology of the self. In A. Goldberg (Ed.), *Advances in self psychology*, 449-456. New York: International Universities Press.
- Kohut, H. (1980c). Reflections on Advances in self psychology. In A. Goldberg (Ed.), *Advances in self psychology*, 473-554. New York: International Universities Press.
- Kohut, H. (1984). *How does analysis cure?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kobak, R. & Sceery, A. (1988). Attachment in late adolescence: Working models, affect regulation, and perception of self and others. *Child Development*, 59, 135-146.
- Kroger, J. (1985). Intrapsychic dimensions of identity during late adolescence. In G. R. Adams, T. P. Gullota, & R. Montemayor (Eds.), *Adolescent identity formation* Vol. 4, 122-143. London: Sage.
- Kwawer, J. J., (1979). Borderline phenomena, interpersonal relations, and the Rorschach test. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, 43, 515-524.
- Kwawer, J. J., (1980). Primitive interpersonal modes, borderline phenomena, and Rorschach content. In J. S. Kwawer, H. D. Lerner, P. M. Lerner, & A. Sugarman (Eds.), *Borderline phenomena and the Rorschach test* (pp. 89-105). New York: International Universities Press.
- Lerner, H., & St. Peter, S. (1984). The Rorschach H response and object relations. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 48, 345-350.
- Liberman, A. F. (1987). Separation in infancy and early childhood: Contributions of attachment theory and psychoanalysis. In J. Bloom-Feshbach & S. Bloom-Feshbach (Eds.), *The psychology of separation and loss*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Lopez, L. M. (1991). *Women, their object relations and how they resolve conflicts with others*. (Doctoral dissertation, Adelphi University, Institute of Advanced Psychological Studies, 1991).
- Mahler, M. (1968). *On human symbiosis and the vicissitudes of individuation: Vol. 1: Infantile Psychosis*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mahler, M. (1972). On the first three sub-phases of the separation-individuation process. In P. Buckley (Ed.), *Essential papers on object relations* (pp. 200-221). New York: University Press
- Mahler, M. (1975). On the current status of the infantile neurosis. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 23, 713-742.
- Mahler, M., Pine, F., & Bergman, A. (1975). *The psychological birth of the human infant*. New York: Basic Books.
- Main, M., Kaplan, N., & Cassidy, J. (1985). Security in infancy, childhood, and adulthood: A move to the level of representation. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), *Monographs of the society for research in child development*, 50 (1-2), 66-104.
- Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. *Journal of Personality and social psychology*, 551-558.
- Marcia, J. E. (1967). Ego identity status: Relationship to self-esteem, "general maladjustment," and authoritarianism. *Journal of Personality*, 35, 118-133.
- Marcia, J. (1976). Identity six years after: A follow-up study. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, (5) 145-160.
- Marcia, J. E. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In Adelson, J. (ed.), *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology*, Wiley: New York.
- Marcia, J. E. (1994). Ego identity and object relations. In J.M. Masling & R. F. Bornstein (Eds.), *Empirical Perspectives on Object Relations Theory* (pp. 59-103). Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.
- Markus, H., & Wurf, E. (1987). The dynamic self-concept: A social psychological perspective. *Annual review of Psychology*, 38, 299-337.
- Marris, P. (1982). Attachment and society. In C. M. Parkes & J. Stevenson-Hinde (Eds.), *The place of attachment in human behavior* 185-201. London: Tavistock.

- May, J. (1990). Attachment security and separation-individuation patterns in middle adolescent population. unpublished doctoral dissertation, Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ.
- Mayman, M. (1967). Object representations and object relationships in Rorschach responses. *Journal of projective Techniques and Personality assessment*, 31, 17-24.
- Mayman, M. (1968). Early memories and character structure. *Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality assessment*, 32, 303-316.
- Mayman, M. (1977). A multi-dimensional view of the Rorschach movement response: Perception, fantasy, kinesthesia, self-representation, and object-relationships. In M.A. Rickers-Ovsiankina (Ed.), *Rorschach psychology* (pp. 229-250). Huntington, New York: Kroeger.
- Miripol, P. (1982). Clinical and statistical validation of current object relations measures. Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 1260B.
- Moore, B. E., & Fine, B. D. (1990). *Psychoanalytic terms and concepts*. (Eds.), New Haven and London: American Psychoanalytic Association and Yale University Press.
- Mortimer, J. T. & Lawrence, J. L. (1980). Self concept stability and change from late adolescence to early adulthood (pp. 1-39). In R. G. Simmons (Ed.). *Research in community and mental health*, V. 2 Greenwich: JAI.
- Murphey, E. B., Silber, E., Coelho, G. V., Hamburg, D., & Greenberg, I. (1963). Development of autonomy and parent-child interaction in late adolescence. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 33, 643-652.
- Murray, H. A., (1938). *Explorations in personality*. New York: Oxford.
- Orlofsky, J. L., Marcia, J. E., & Lesser, I. M. (1973). Ego identity status and their intimacy versus isolation crisis of young adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 27 (2), 211-219.
- Offer, D., & Offer, J. B. (1975). *From Teenager to Young Manhood*, New York: Basic Books
- Parker, G., Tupling, H., & Brown, L. B. (1979). A parental bonding instrument. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 52, 1-10.
- Paterson, R. J., & Moran, G. (1988). Attachment theory, personality development, and psychotherapy. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 8, 611-636.

- Pistole, M. C. (1989). Attachment in adult romantic relationships: Style of conflict resolution and relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 6, 505-510.
- Redondo, L. M., Martin, A. L., Fernandez, J. S., & Lopez, J. M. (1986). *An examination of the relationship between family environment and juvenile delinquency*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Santiago, Chile.
- Richman, J. A., & Flaherty, J. A. (1987). Adult psychosocial assets and depressive mood over time: Effects of internalized childhood attachments. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, Vol. 175, 703-712.
- Roid, G., & Fitts, W. (1988). *Tennessee Self-Concept Scale: Revised Manual*. Western Psychological Services, Los Angeles, CA.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and Adolescent Self-Image*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.
- Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the self*. New York: Basic.
- Ryan, E. R. & Bell, M. D. (1984). Changes in object relations from psychosis to recovery. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 93 (2), 209-215.
- Rogers, C. R. (1950). The significance of the self-regarding attitudes and perceptions. In M. L. Reymert (Ed.). *Feelings and emotions: The Mooseheart Symposium*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rogers, C. R. (1951). *Client centered therapy*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Sandler, J., & Rosenblatt, B. (1962). The concepts of the representational world. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, (17), 138-245.
- Schafer, R. (1973). Concepts of self and identity and the experience of separation-individuation in adolescence. *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 42, 42-59.
- Segal, H. G., Westen, D., Lohr, N. E., Silk, K. R., & Cohen, R. (1992) Assessing object relations and social cognition in borderline personality disorders from stories told to the picture arrangement subtest of the WAIS-R. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 6 (4), 458-470.
- Shaver, P. R., & Brennan, K. A. (1992). Attachment styles and the "big five" personality traits: Their connections with each other and with romantic relationship outcomes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 536-545.

- Shaver, P. R. & Clark, C. L. (1994). The psychodynamics of adult romantic attachment. In J. M. Masling & R. F. Bornstein (Eds.), *Empirical perspectives on object relations theory* (pp. 105-156). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Shaver, P. R. & Hazan, C. (1988). A biased overview of the study of love. *Journal of Social and personal relationships*, 5, 473-501.
- Slugoski, B. R., Marcia, J. E., & Koopman, R. F. (1984). Cognitive and social interactional characteristics of ego identity statuses in college males. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, (6), 614-626.
- Silver, R. (1995). College adjustment: relationships to attachment security, separation-individuation, and style of coping. unpublished doctoral dissertation, Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ.
- Smith, T. E. (1993). Measurement of object relations: A review. *Journal of Psychotherapy and Practice*, 2, 19-37.
- Sperling, M. B. (1988). The object relations technique as an attachment measure. In M.B.Sperling (Chair), *Assessment of adult attachment: Conceptual and methodological issues*. Symposium conducted at the midwinter meeting of the Society for Personality Assessment, New Orleans.
- Sperling, M. B., & Berman, W. H., (Ed.). (1994). *Attachment in adults*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Sroufe, L. A., & Waters, E. (1977). Attachment as an organizational construct. *Child Development*, 48, 1184-1199.
- St. Clair, M. (1996). *Object relations and self psychology*. New York: Brooks-Cole.
- Strickler, G., & Healey, B. J. (1990). Projective assessment of object relations: A review of the empirical literature. *Psychological Assessment*, 2, (3), 219-230.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1989). *Using multivariate statistics*, New York: Harper Collins
- Tyson, P., & Tyson, R. L. (1990). *Psychoanalytic theories of development*. Yale University Press: New Haven.
- Urist, J. (1977). The Rorschach test and the assessment of object relations. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 41, 3-9.
- Urist, J. (1980). Object relations. In R. W. Woody (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of clinical assessment* (Vol. 2, pp. 821-833). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Urist, J., & Shill, M. (1982). Validity of the Rorschach Mutuality of Autonomy Scale: A replication using excerpted responses. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 46, 450-454.
- Waters, E. & Sroufe, L. A. (1983). Social competence as a developmental construct. *Developmental Review*, 3, 79-97.
- Weiss, R. S. (1986). The attachment bond in childhood and adulthood. In C. M. Parkes, J. Stevenson-Hinde, & P. Marris (Eds.), *Attachment across the life cycle* (pp. 66-76). London: Routledge
- West, M., Sheldon, A., & Reiffer, L. (1987). An approach to the delineation of adult attachment: Scale development and reliability. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 175, 738-741.
- Westen, D. (1990a). Psychoanalytic approaches to personality. In L. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 21-65). New York: Guilford Press.
- Westen, D. (1990b). The relations among narcissism, egocentrism, self-concept, and self-esteem: Experimental, clinical, and theoretical considerations. *Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Thought*, 13, 183-239.
- Westen, D. (1991a). Clinical assessment of object relations using TAT. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 56, (1), 56-74.
- Westen, D. (1991b). Social cognition and object relations. *Psychological Bulletin*, 109, (3), 429-455.
- Westen, D., Lohr, N., Silk, K., Kellam, A., Gold, L., & Kerber, K. ((1990). Object relations and social cognition in borderlines, major depressives, and normals. A thematic apperception test analysis. *Psychological Assessment*, 2, (4), 355-364.
- Westen, D., Lohr, N., Silk, K., Kellam, A., Gold, L., & Lohr, N. (1990). Object relations and social cognition in borderlines, major depressives, and normals. A thematic apperception test analysis. *Psychological Assessment*, 2, (4), 355-364.
- Winnicott, D. W. (1965a). A personal view of the Kleinian contribution. In *The maturational processes and the facilitating environment* 229-242. London: Tavistock. (Original work published 1951).
- Winnicott, D. W. (1965b). From dependence to independence in the development of the individual. In *The maturational processes and the facilitating environment* (pp. 83-99). New York: International Universities Press. (Original work published 1963).

Winnicott, D. W. (1965c). Psychiatric disorders in terms of infantile maturational processes. *In The maturational processes and the facilitating environment* (pp.230-241). New York: International Universities Press. (Original work published 1963).

Wiss, F. C. (1991). *Aspects of self*. unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1991, 1-126.

Appendix A

Letter to Potential Participants

Letter for Potential Participants

Faculty:

Please read this letter to the class one week before the study.

Dear Student,

My name is Florence Gussoni-Leone, M.A. I am a doctoral student in the Professional Psychology and Family Therapy Department at Seton Hall University and currently finishing my degree in Clinical Psychology. One of the requirements for doctoral students is the completion of a research project/dissertation. Because of my interest in human development and personal relationships, I wish to look at these constructs in relation to adult relatedness and first and second-year college age students. It is my hope that what is learned in this study will benefit the students at the Universities involved and at other colleges and universities.

I have been given permission, by the Department Chair and faculty to recruit freshmen and sophomore students from the [undergraduate] psychology subject pool at the University. The subject pool is made up of undergraduate psychology students that as part of the introduction to psychology are asked to [voluntarily] participate in research studies of their choice, and receive extra credit upon the discretion of the professor.

I will attend your next class to give a brief presentation and recruit any interested students to voluntarily participate in this study. The study includes five questionnaires and will take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

Any questions will be answered at class presentation.

Thank you,

Florence Gussoni-Leone, M.A.

Appendix B

Consent Form

Consent Form

Dear Student,

I have been given permission, by the Department Chair and faculty to recruit freshmen and sophomore students from the [undergraduate] psychology subject pool at the University. The subject pool are made up of undergraduate psychology students, that as part of the introduction to psychology are asked to [voluntarily] participate in research studies of their choice, and receive extra credit upon the discretion of the professor.

I hope that you, as a first or second-year student, will be able to volunteer to participate in this study. The questionnaires that are enclosed, if you choose to participate in this study include: the Bell Object Relations Inventory, Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment, Relationship Experience Scale, and Continuity and Integration of Self Scale. A Demographic/Background Information form will also be included. This form will also assess your feelings about yourself and your relationships.

Consent Section

I understand that the research study in which I am about to participate involves the administration of several questionnaires, which should take approximately 30 minutes to complete. I also understand that no psychological, social, or physical risk is associated with my participation, beyond that associated with a moderate level of introspection and self-examination. In fact, I may come to have a greater understanding of myself following this study.

I understand that my participation and all information I give is **confidential**. At the beginning of the study, the envelope I receive will be randomly assigned an ID number which will be used to identify all envelopes distributed. I will not be asked to place my name or any identifying information on the materials in my packet. **Anonymity** is insured by the coding of questionnaires by numbers.

I understand that my participation in this study is strictly **voluntary**. I am free not to participate or to withdraw at any point without any consequences. My agreement to participate will be indicated by my completion of the questionnaires.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research (IRB), Montclair State University Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research (IRB), and William Paterson University Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research (IRB). The IRB believes that the research protocol adequately safeguard your privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The SHU Chairperson (Robert Hallissey, Ph.D.) of the IRB may be reached through the Office of Grants and Research Services at (973) 275 -

2874, MSU contact person (Susan Nanney) of the IRB at (973) 655 – 4128 and WPU Chairperson (Martin Williams) of the IRB at (973) 720 – 3263. As indicated above, situations that would impinge on your privacy, welfare or civil liberties and rights have been carefully avoided.

I have read the material above, and any questions I asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this activity, realizing that I may withdraw without prejudice at anytime.

Thank-you,

Florence Gussoni-Leone

Having been fully informed of the nature of this study, I give full consent and participation.

Print Full Name

Signature

Date

Do not place in envelope. Please give to faculty or examiner to insure anonymity.

Appendix C

Instructions for Completing Questionnaires

In your envelope you will find the following five questionnaires:

Demographic/Background Information form
Bell object Relations Inventory (BORI; BORRTI Form O)
Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA)
Relationship Experience Scale (RES)
Continuity and Integration of Self Scale (CISS)

In completing each questionnaire, please follow these instructions:

Do not put your name on any of the testing materials. There is a number on each which there is for research purposes but in no way will identify you.

Directions are printed at the beginning of each test. Please read all information carefully and follow the individual instructions.

It is important that every item be answered. With questions that are difficult to answer, respond to the best of your ability, by how you usually feel. There are no right or wrong answers.

All answers are to be placed directly on the questionnaires.

Your honesty in responding is extremely important. Please do not hesitate to ask questions. When you have completed the testing, place them in the envelope and return the envelope to the faculty member in class.

If you have any questions or concerns about this research study, or need to or desire to talk, please contact the researcher (Florence Gussoni-Leone) at (646) 672- 6232. Or if you prefer, you may contact me through the Department of Psychology by calling (973) 761- 9451.

Thank-you,

Florence Gussoni-Leone

Appendix D
Summary of Findings

If you are interested in receiving a summary of the findings of this study, please complete the enclosed form and return it to the Faculty member. In order to preserve your confidentiality, do not put the request form back into the envelope. You could contact the researcher (Florence Gussoni) with your request at (646) 672 – 6232. Or if you prefer, you may contact me through the Department of Psychology by calling (973) 761 9451.

DETACH BOTTOM PORTION

Request Form

I am interested in receiving a summary of the findings of the study: Adult Relatedness of College Students conducted by Florence Gussoni-Leone, M. A., during the Spring semester, 2001.

Name:

Address:

Appendix E

Demographic/Biographical and Background Information

Appendix E

PERSONAL DATA

DEMOGRAPHIC/BIOGRAPHICAL AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please complete the following information by using a checkmark (x).

1. Age: _____ DOB: _____

2. Sex:

_____ Male
_____ Female

3. Current year in college:

4. Current marital status:

_____ Single
_____ Married
_____ Separated
_____ Divorced
_____ Widowed

5. Please mark the race or ethnicity that you think applies to you best:

_____ African-American/African/Afro-Caribbean/Black, not of Hispanic origin
_____ Caucasian/White, not of Hispanic origin
_____ Hispanic
_____ Asian-American/Pacific Islander
_____ Native-American
_____ Race/ethnicity not included above, please specify

6. Religious background:

- ☐ Protestant
- ☐ Catholic
- ☐ Jewish
- ☐ Muslim
- ☐ Hindu
- ☐ Buddhist
- ☐ Other
- ☐ None

7. What is your parents' marital status?

- ☐ Married
- ☐ Separated
- ☐ Divorced
- ☐ Widowed
- ☐ Never married

8. By whom were you raised (predominant caretakers in your first 16 years of life)?

- ☐ Both parents
- ☐ Mother only
- ☐ Father only
- ☐ One parent and other relative(s)
- ☐ Other relative(s) only
- ☐ If parents are divorced, did you see non-custodial parent on a regular basis.
- ☐ Other

9. If you were brought up by both parents, please describe the quality of their marital relationship.

- ☐ Very good
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Fair/Average
- ☐ Poor
- ☐ Very poor

10. With how many siblings (brothers and sisters) were you raised?

11. What is your birth order among your siblings?

- ☐ Only child
☐ Oldest
☐ Middle range
☐ Youngest

12. Do you live at home with your parents?

Yes ☐ No ☐

13. If you are residing at college, how far do you currently live from your parent's home?
 _____ (Approximate miles).

14. Please approximate your family income:

- ☐ Under \$25,000
☐ \$25,000-\$35,000
☐ \$36,000-\$45,000
☐ \$46,000-\$55,000
☐ \$56,000-\$70,000
☐ Over \$79,000

Relationship Experiences

Please answer the following questions in light of your romantic relationships, past and current, during the last 5 years.

- A. How many romantic relationships have you been involved in? -----
 B. How many of your past and current relationships do you
 consider to have been serious. -----
 C. How many partners have you been involved with for 3 months or longer? -----
 D. How long was the longest relationship in which you have been involved? -----
 E. How long has or did your most recent serious relationship last? -----

Appendix F

Purpose of the Study

Appendix F

PURPOSE OF STUDY

How people think of themselves in relationship to others (object relations theory), the bond that develops between child and caregiver and the effect this has for an individual's emerging self-concept and developing view of the world (attachment theory), the consistency and stability of one's sense of self (self psychology) should all influence the development of human relatedness and its function in the maturation and manifestation of one's personality. Yet, there has been little empirical research to date that explores the integration and relationship of these disparate theories and adult relatedness. The purpose of this study in which you have just participated in attempts to examine and provide preliminary empirical data about these relationships.

The Demographic and Background Information form will be used to help the examiner to understand how your life experiences affect how your answers on the other self-report instruments. The other self-report measures were developed to provide the examiner with significant data about your perceptions of yourself and your relationships.

Confidentiality will be insured. A randomly assigned ID number was provided on each packet distributed. If you feel that you do not want your questionnaire to be included in this study, please inform the examiner.

I appreciate your participation and the time you have put into this study. I hope that this experience has been an educational one for you. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact the researcher (Florence Gussoni-Leone) at (646) - 672 - 6232. Or if you prefer, you may contact me through the Department of Psychology by calling (973) 761 - 9451.

Thank you,

Florence Gussoni-Leone, M.A., Graduate Student
Clinical Psychology
Seton Hall University
South Orange, New Jersey